The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, APRIL 7, 1883.

CURRENT TOPICS.

We have reason to believe that the consideration of the draft of the proposed new rules of court was not completed at the last meeting of the Rule Committee of Judges on Tuesday.

It is understood that the office of Secretary of Causes to the Master of the Rolls is to be abolished; and that the business of the Orders of Course Office is to be transferred to another department of the Chancery Division.

Since the work of the Orders of Course Office is to be transferred, it may be suggested whether certain orders of course now necessary to be obtained, and which are of a purely formal character, might not be dispensed with; for instance, orders to amend writs, and many others of a like character.

Up to Monday last there were no fewer than 142 amendments to the Government Bankruptcy Bill set down for consideration by the Grand Committee. Mr. Dixon Hartland has since handed in a large number of amendments.

Eighteen of the nineteen courts in the building of the Royal Courts of Justice were occupied on Thursday last. The nineteenth court, being Queen's Bench Court No. IX., is being completed, and will soon be ready for use.

The profession may be congratulated on the appointment which has been made to the Mastership of the Rolls. Sir Baliol Brett's judicial characteristics are too well known to our readers to need recounting; but we may venture to say that he is certainly the judge, who in rapid apprehension of facts and logical power, comes nearest to the late Master of the Rolls. The important question now is, will the Court of Appeal be strengthened by Sir Baliol Brett's successor?

The Grand Committee of the House of Commons on Law and Justice is being thinned of its already scanty proportion of practical lawyers. Out of the sixty-four members originally selected, only twenty are, we believe, actually engaged in the practice of the law, and of these Mr. H. H. Fowler and Mr. Gregory have since been discharged from service on the committee. Mr. Grantham, Q.C., has been added to it.

The small volume, extending to upwards of fifty pages of letterpress, which contains the lists of matters set down before the Court of Appeal and the several divisions of the High Court of Justice for the Easter Sittings, shows that 2,239 causes, &c., claim the attention of judges and juries during these sittings, consisting of thirty-four days only. When the Hilary Sittings commenced, the list contained 1,994 causes, but it would be a difficult task to ascertain how many of those in the earlier list remain in the present list.

The work for the two divisions of the Court of Appeal is shown by a list of 261 appeals, of which 115 are from the Chancery Division and from the Stannaries Court of Cornwall and the County Palatine Court of Lancaster; 133 from the Queen's Bench Division, and from the Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty Division, and 13 from the Court of Bankruptcy. At the beginning of the Hilary Sittings there were 231 appeals, and a year ago only 183.

The Chancery Cause List, which we print elsewhere, shows 172 actions before Vice-Chancellor Bacon, 138 before Mr. Justice Fry, 209 before Mr. Justice Kay, 241 before Mr. Justice Chitty, and 110 before Mr. Justice Pearson, making a total of 870 actions, &c., in the Chancery Division. The increase, to which we have before referred, still continues, as will be evident when we state that the lists of last sittings contained 816 actions, &c., and the lists of a year ago 615 only.

The list of matters set down for the Queen's Bench Division contains 2 new trials standing for judgment, and 64 for argument. The special paper contains 4 cases for argument and 43 opposed motions. The Crown paper shows a list of 113 matters, and the Revenue paper 5 matters. There are also 567 actions for trial with juries, and 67 without juries. In the Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty Division there are 7 probate causes set down to be heard with special juries, 20 without juries, and 9 with common juries. There are also 104 matrimonial causes (of which 38 are undefended), and 4 to be heard with special juries, and 14 with common juries, besides 85 which temporarily stand out of the list. The Admiralty cases number 21.

On Tuesday last, in the case of *Reg.* v. *Lancashire Justices*, a divisional court (Denman, Field, and Hawkins, JJ.) once more affirmed the doctrine laid down in *White, Appellant; Justices of Coquetdale, Respondents* (L. R. 7 Q. B. D. 238), and *Ex parte Todd* (L. R. 3 Q. B. D. 407), that an application for the transfer of a licence must be made during the currency of the licence proposed to be transferred, otherwise the justices in special sessions have no jurisdiction. Both the case to which we are referring and the *Coquetdale case* appear to have been properly decided on their own peculiar facts, but we cannot help thinking that the *dicta* of the learned judges in some of the cases have gone further than is warranted by the words of the statute relating to transfers of licences. The statute is 9 Geo. 4, c. 61, s. 14, which enumerates the cases in which the application for a transfer may be made. These cases are death, incapacity, bankruptcy, or removal of the licensed person, "or if the occupier of any such house, being about to quit the same, shall have wilfully omitted, or shall have neglected, to apply at the general annual licensing meeting, or at any adjournment thereof, for a licence to continue to sell exciseable liquors by retail." The reported decisions proceed on the ground that the words "duly licensed" or "so licensed" govern all that follows; but it will be observed that these words do not precede the statement of the case of an occupier omitting to apply at the annual licensing meeting. It would seem a fair conclusion, therefore, that these words are not to be read in. The hardship of the case consists in this. All licences expire on the 10th of October, whereas adjourned licensing meetings cannot, by 9 Geo. 4, c. 61, s. 3, be held later than the 30th of September. It is easy, therefore, to imagine cases—for instance, where an outgoing tenant neglected to apply at the latest adjourned meeting—where there would be only ten days within which to apply for a transfer, and as there are only eight special sessions at the most in the year, held "at periods as near as may be equally distant" (9 Geo. 4, c. 61, s. 4), cases may also happen in which no application for a transfer could be made. In such cases, therefore,

the application would have to be for a new licence, the grant of which requires confirmation by a licensing committee. This appears to be a great hardship, and although hardship did not constrain the court to grant relief in the *Coquetdale case*, it might, perhaps, afford some reason why another court should distinguish that case upon the grounds which we have attempted to point out.

Sir Henry Peek, M.P., after a few years' repose, has recommenced his operations against bankrupt solicitors. He has apparently abandoned his design of making the *Law List* a biographical record of the careers in the Court of Bankruptcy of insolvent members of the profession; and he has come to the conclusion that a solicitor who has only been once bankrupt may still be allowed to practise without danger to the commonwealth, although he thinks that a solicitor who has been once bankrupt ought not to be allowed to fill such exalted and responsible positions as solicitor to a sanitary authority, burial board, or select vestry. There may perhaps be some inconsistency in a person in ill odour filling the office of solicitor to a sanitary authority, but if there is such an office as solicitor to a burial board or select vestry (which may be doubted), we are at present unable to see any public or private danger or inconvenience necessarily involved in permitting a solicitor who has been once bankrupt to investigate the title to land proposed to be purchased for a cemetery, or to transact such legal matters (if any) connected with select vestries as are not, by 13 & 14 Vict. c. 57, confided to the vestry clerk. But we have not yet explained how Sir H. Peek proposes to carry out his design. Clause 28 of the Government Bankruptcy Bill provides that—

"Where a debtor is adjudged bankrupt he shall, subject to the provisions of this Act, be disqualified from [*inter alia*] (*e*) being elected to or holding or exercising the office of guardian of the poor, member of a sanitary authority, or member of a school board, highway board, burial board, or select vestry."

To this clause Sir H. Peek proposes in Grand Committee to add,

"or solicitor to any such body; and any solicitor or auctioneer who shall have been adjudged bankrupt a second time shall be disqualified from renewing his annual certificate or licence respectively."

In other words, a solicitor who has been twice bankrupt is to be practically struck off the roll without any judicial inquiry or investigation, whatever may be the amount of the dividend paid on his bankruptcies or the circumstances under which they have occurred. If this provision is just and requisite in the public interest, why should it be restricted to solicitors and auctioneers? What about stockbrokers, who receive large sums for investment; surveyors, who negotiate purchases, and land agents, who receive rents and manage estates? The remedy proposed appears to us to be altogether misconceived. The matter is one which properly falls within the province of the Incorporated Law Society as registrar of solicitors. As we long ago urged, if anything is to be done with reference to it, it can only be effectively done through their agency; and, when any steps are taken to consider the subject, it is to be hoped that the council will deal, not merely with insolvency, but also with the general subject of malpractice.

The third edition of the Rules under the Trade-Marks Registration Acts has just been issued, and is now in force. In most respects these rules are naturally a repetition of those issued in 1876, but there are some few alterations of importance. The first of these is contained in the 5th and 6th rules, which provide for applications for registration being made in a new prescribed form. This form requires no statutory declaration as to length of user or title, which was required in the case of both old and new marks under the rules in force till last August, and in the case of old marks under the rules then made. It is worthy of observation that, however little applicable this requirement may have been to new marks, in the case of old marks it was calculated to exercise a very sensible and useful influence in checking fraudulent claims. As it is, under the new code a man may seek to obtain all the advantages of an old mark, and yet risk nothing if his deceit is discovered. It is noticeable that, by rules 25 and 26, the declaration as to title is still required from an assignee or transmittee of a trade-mark applying to be registered as a subsequent proprietor, though the consequence of an untrue statement can hardly be said to be more serious. Rule 16 provides a means of clearing the application list of the applications which have been made during the last seven years, but have not been proceeded with, and have, therefore, from the want of such a power as the new rule supplies, gone on accumulating to such an extent as to occasion much inconvenience. Now, if an application is not proceeded with within twelve months from its date, or six months from its advertisement, it is to be treated as abandoned. Rule 20 purports to give the registrar a power which might very usefully be conferred upon him, and which it is proposed to confer on him by statute in the new Government Patents Bill—viz., to register the same mark in respect of different descriptions of goods in the same class, without any necessity for an application to the court, as in *Re Braby & Co.* (30 W. R. 675, L. R. 21 Ch. D. 223). But it seems that this rule raises the important question whether the Lord Chancellor has power, under section 7 of the Act of 1875, to make rules on a subject which is provided for by the express terms of the Act of Parliament, and in a way different from the way in which the rule deals with it. The 6th section of that Act provides that "the registrar shall not, without the leave of the court, register in respect of the same goods or *classes* of goods" a trade-mark identical with or similar to one already registered with respect to such "goods or classes of goods," so that, while the rule professes to give the registrar power to register the same mark for different goods in the same class, the Act denies him the power to do so without the leave of the court first obtained. As the object is desirable, it may be that no objection will be taken to the rule, but it is a strong thing to repeal the provisions of an Act of Parliament by a Lord Chancellor's rule. If this rule stands as at present, the 33rd rule as to removing a mark from the register after five years, if the registered proprietor is not engaged in any business concerned in any goods in the class in which he is registered, requires some corresponding modification. Rule 44 retains the old provision as to trying disputed claims by special case, though this has been found in practice to be so unworkable that not more than two or three—certainly not half a dozen—cases have ever been tried in that way since the Acts were passed. Rules 57 to 61, while recognizing the dissolution of the Manchester Committee of Experts as to cotton marks, provides for the continuance of the system of A. and B. lists of cotton marks, and such marks are still to be registered after three weeks only, though there seems to be no sufficient reason for retaining them as a distinct class in this or any other respect.

One of the first judicial acts of the new Master of the Rolls has been to determine the extent to which the principle laid down by the Court of Appeal in the case of *Stevens* v. *Morson* (26 Solicitors' Journal, 25), to which we referred last week, is binding. In that case Lindley, L.J., in delivering the judgment of the court (which included both the late and the present Masters of the Rolls), said "that the rule that a claim against the estate of a dead man, supported only by the uncorroborated testimony of the claimant, would not be admitted, was a sound general rule. It was not an absolute rule of law, so that a judge could be bound to direct a jury, as a matter of law, that they would not find for the claim if it was supported by no other evidence. But the judge ought to warn the jury of the danger of acting on such evidence if uncorroborated." And in the recent case of *Re Wynne-Finch* v. *Wynne-Finch* (48 L. T. N. S. at p. 132), Jessel, M.R., said of the rule, "It is not a rule of law, but it is a question to be decided by a jury, *although the judge must recommend the jury not to trust the uncorroborated evidence.*" But in deciding the appeal in *Lawrence* v. *Rowley*, on Tuesday last, the new Master of the Rolls is reported to have said that "the case was reduced to the question whether the learned judge was bound to caution the jury. His lordship knew of no law to that effect. Some juries required a strong caution, whereas others required no caution at all." But he added that "the present decision did not derogate from the general rule that, *unless a learned judge sees to the contrary*, it is usual and wise, where the estate of a deceased person is about to be affected by the uncorroborated evidence of the plaintiff, to tell the jury to be cautious in acting upon that evidence." This new "general rule," if correctly reported, appears to involve the following propositions:—(1) It is usual and wise to caution the

jury; (2) but if a learned judge "sees to the contrary," it is not necessary to caution the jury—which propositions may be condensed into the single one that henceforth every judge is to be a law unto himself.

Upon a little point to which we have often referred—the authority of the marginal notes appended to statutes—the late Master of the Rolls took the opportunity afforded by the case of *Sutton* v. *Sutton* (L. R. 22 Ch. D. 513) of withdrawing one of his very few erroneous *dicta*. It will be remembered that in *Re Venour's Settled Estates* (24 W. R. 753, L. R. 2 Ch. D., at p. 255) he said that "the marginal note is now comprised in the original print and is a part of the statute, and is subject to be dealt with, like any other parts of an Act of Parliament, by amendments on motion or otherwise. The old observations as to marginal notes not being on the Parliament Roll, and, therefore, being no part of the Acts, do not apply to modern Acts." This *dictum* was strongly dissented from by the Court of Appeal in *Attorney-General* v. *Great Eastern Railway Company* (L. R. 11 Ch. D., at p. 255); and when it was cited during the argument in *Sutton* v. *Sutton*, Sir George Jessel said, "The *dictum* in that case is not strictly correct. I have since ascertained that the practice is so uncertain as to the marginal notes that it cannot be laid down that they are always on the roll. But the title of the Act is always on the roll." What would be the result if the courts were bound to look at the marginal notes of modern statutes it is difficult to conjecture. As we all know from the Conveyancing Act, 1881, marginal notes are nowadays apt to get into the wrong places; and as we find from the Conveyancing Act, 1882, they are also apt to contain puzzling fossil remains belonging to the early period when the section was in process of creation.

THE NEW PATENTS, DESIGNS, AND TRADE-MARKS BILLS.

I.

The interest taken by the public in the subjects with which this article is headed is sufficiently attested by the fact that there are now before Parliament no less than four Bills dealing with them. Of these, the first, brought in by Mr. Chamberlain and the Solicitor-General, on behalf of the Government, deals with all three subjects; the second, brought in by Sir John Lubbock, on behalf of the Society of Arts, deals only with patents, except in so far as it confers jurisdiction in matters of designs and trade-marks on the new authority proposed to be constituted by the Bill; the third Bill, backed by Mr. Anderson and some other members, deals only with patents; and the fourth Bill, introduced by Mr. Arnold, and which has already been the occasion of a count-out of the House of Commons, attempts to vary the law of trade-marks in only one respect.

In considering these Bills, it will naturally be convenient to review, first, the provisions which they contain with regard to what is the main subject of the first Bill, and, practically, the only subject of the second and third—viz., patents for inventions. The manner in which these three Bills propose to treat this subject is very different, since the third Bill, while proposing to make certain changes in the existing law which would be by no means of insignificant importance, is merely an attempt at amendment in these respects, whereas both the Government Bill and that of the Society of Arts pursue the more ambitious, but also far more convenient and scientific, course of repealing all existing Acts on the subject (except that the Government Bill does not propose to repeal the patents section of the Statute of Monopolies), and making an enactment which will be in effect, though not in name, a code of British Patent Law. The Society of Arts' Bill even goes so far as to repeal all existing rules and regulations. The advisability of such a repeal and codification is sufficiently apparent as soon as it is stated that there are now in existence no less than nine Acts of Parliament relating to patents, six to copyright of designs, three to trade-marks (besides the Merchandise Marks Act of 1862), and two to exhibitions. In deciding whether to proceed by way of amending Acts, or by way of codification, practical considerations must carry most weight, and it must be assumed that both the Government and the Society of Arts see their way to getting a patent code through Parliament, with the aid of the newly-invented Grand Committee. If this anticipation is well founded, the course taken is undoubtedly justified, and, in any case, it would be very difficult for such extensive changes as they propose to be carried into effect without a fresh start being made.

While, however, both the main Bills agree in this respect, they are seen to diverge as soon as the enactments proposed to be substituted for those repealed come into view, and it may be as well to say at once that, in some important respects, the Bill promoted by the Society of Arts appears to deal with the questions raised in a more satisfactory way than that brought in by the Government. The first point to which attention may be directed is with regard to the authority to which it is proposed to intrust the administration of the patent law of this country. There has for years past been no difference of opinion as to the fact that the existing Commissioners of Patents—viz., the Lord Chancellor, the Master of the Rolls, and the English, Scotch, and Irish law officers (to whom, by the way, no persons have ever been added as the Act of 1852 allows)—constitute an exceedingly unsatisfactory tribunal, and the Government Bill proposes that in their stead the person in charge of the Patent Office shall be a "comptroller-general" acting under the superintendence and direction of the Board of Trade (clause 75), and with a right to refer any administrative question of doubt or difficulty to the law officers for England (clause 85). The Patent Museum is separated from the Patent Office and handed over to the Department of Science and Art (clause 38). The Board of Trade, to which power is given to make rules (clause 90), is, in fact, made the supreme patent authority; certain functions being reserved to the law officers, and the power of prolongation to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council; so that, reckoning the comptroller-general, there are no less than four different authorities. On the other hand, the Society of Arts Bill (clause 8), supported by the third Bill (clause 2), proposes that a board of three commissioners of patents should be constituted, to whom all questions relating to patents, other than actions for infringement, should be assigned. The Society of Arts suggest that one of the commissioners should be experienced in engineering, one in chemistry, and one in law, and make no difference between their titles and positions, whereas Mr. Anderson's Bill suggests that they should be called chief, second, and third commissioners, but contains no reference to their qualifications. The great point is that, in the opinion of those best qualified to represent inventors and patent lawyers alike, the proper tribunal for patent administration is one composed of three officials, whose previous pursuits shall have fitted them for the discharge of their duties, and whose whole time shall be given up to those duties, rather than a body dealing with all sorts of miscellaneous subjects, and having no special knowledge of either science, art, inventions, or law, and whose inefficiency for the duties proposed to be conferred on it is virtually admitted by the proposal to call in the Judicial Committee in one case, and the law officers in others, to its assistance. The American practice is strongly in favour of the Board of Commissioners, as the patent authorities in the United States consist of a commissioner, an assistant commissioner and three examiners in chief, who have the control of the Patent Office entirely in their own hands, and it really seems hardly possible to doubt that a properly appointed commission is the most likely body to deal on true principles and on a fair and uniform system with patent matters. The law officers have quite enough to do in other matters without exercising a fitful authority over patents, and the Board of Trade is also sufficiently occupied. As for the Judicial Committee, petitions for prolongation constitute no large part of its business and would not be missed. In this respect, therefore, we think the proposal of the Society of Arts should be adopted.

With respect to the grantee of letters patent, it is provided both by the Government Bill (clause 4) and by the Society of Arts' Bill (clause 6) that a grant may be made to any person, whether a British or a foreign subject, and each Bill also provides for the case of a previous patent abroad, the Society of Arts' Bill proposing (clause 7) to lay down broadly that, where a foreign or colonial patent has been granted, a British patent can be granted only to the foreign or colonial grantee, or his legal personal representative, by himself, his attorney, or agent, and to the person so qualified only upon his written application within eighteen months from the date of the foreign or colonial grant, or from the date of the

earliest such grant, if more than one. The Government Bill (clause 92) only provides for cases in which the foreign patentee is a subject of a state with which an international arrangement has been come to for the mutual protection of inventions, and, in such cases, it gives the foreign patentee, not the exclusive right to the British patent, but only a prior right in the event of his making an application within six months after the foreign patent. On the whole, it appears to be reasonable to give foreign inventors a priority only, and to restrict this privilege to subjects of foreign States which equally recognize the claims of British inventors, but it would probably be more satisfactory to extend the term during which the priority should be preserved to the period of eighteen months suggested by the Society of Arts. Mr. Anderson's Bill contains a provision with respect to grantees which is not to be found in either of the other Bills, enacting, by clause 12, that public servants may be patentees, except those employed in the Patent Office.

In making an application for a grant, the Government Bill proposes (clause 5) that the inventor should leave at, or send to, the Patent Office an application in the form of a declaration, and also a specification, which may be either provisional or complete, so that two documents only are required. And a very valuable provision in this Bill is that contained in clause 87, that any application to the office may be sent by prepaid letter. At present, as is pointed out in the memorandum prefixed to this Bill, an intending patentee has to apply personally, or by his agent, at the Patent Office at least seven times, and to make four separate payments, using four documents for the application, before he can obtain a complete grant; whereas, under the proposed scheme, only two calls need be made, three documents used, and two payments made; or, by using the post, no call need be made, nor any agency fees paid. Moreover, only eight steps will have to be taken within the office itself, as against eleven at present. The Society of Arts' Bill does not propose to amalgamate the application and declaration, but clause 10 requires an application and a declaration to be lodged at the office, with a provisional or (clause 14) a complete specification, so that there is no substantial difference between the initial steps, except the provision in the Government Bill as to application by letter, which does not appear in the other, and whichever method is adopted will be a great advance upon the present system. The Society's Bill, however, expressly enacts that the provisional specification is to be kept secret, though the application is to be announced, whereas the Government Bill simply omits to provide for publishing the provisional specification, and it is clearly desirable to have a distinct enactment where an existing practice is to be altered. As to the advisability of keeping the provisional specification secret there can be little doubt, as, under the present system, an inventor may supply an idea which he has not leisure or does not immediately see his way to work out, but of which another may avail himself, to the ultimate injury of the true inventor.

The next step is one which marks a great advance in the idea of legislators on the subject of patents, involving as it does nothing less than the recognition of the principle that the State, when taking fees for the concession of a temporary monopoly, is at least bound to take some steps to ensure that the grant made shall be of some value. Both the Government Bill (clause 76) and that of the society (clause 9) provide for the appointment of examiners, to whom (Government Bill, clause 6, Society's Bill, clause 12) the provisional specification (to take the ordinary case in which the complete specification is deferred) is to be referred. This proposal agrees with the American practice, where a staff of more than one hundred examiners is at present at work, with a prospect of an increase before long; and it is certainly in accordance with ordinary notions of morality. The subjects proposed for examination by the two Bills are, however, not precisely the same, as, while both provide for an examination whether the invention is proper subject-matter, the first Bill provides, in addition, for an examination whether the nature of the invention has been fairly described, and whether the documents are in accordance with the rules; whereas the second provides for an examination whether the title sufficiently indicates the nature of the invention, and whether the provisional specification is in accordance with the title. This difference is, however, not very considerable, and, when the principle of examination is admitted, there can be no great difficulty in deciding what subjects shall be submitted to it. In fact, none of those above mentioned could be said to be unfit for it. On what is a really important point—namely, whether there should be an examination as to novelty—both Bills are in accord, and are, at the same time, at variance with Mr. Anderson's Bill, which, while making no provision for the appointment of examiners, enacts (clause 4) that the commissioners are to perfect the library and indexes so as to facilitate searches, and are, on receiving an application, to institute a search as to novelty, and, if there appears to be a defect in this respect, to refer the applicant to the consideration of the possible anticipations before proceeding with the application. On this question of an examination as to novelty the concurrence of the framers of the two principal Bills is, of itself, a strong circumstance, and there appear to be ample grounds for it, since, to throw upon a public department such an investigation is to relieve the *soi-disant* inventor of the *onus* which really lies upon him, and involves an amount of labour and expense altogether disproportionate to the fees which can, without a general protest, be exacted. It is the examination as to novelty which mainly increases the number of examiners in the United States, and this very examination on this point has been found in that country to throw considerable hindrances in the way of inventors, since an examiner may well consider that there has been an anticipation in a case where the differences are so marked that the inventor, if left to himself, would be perfectly willing to run the risk of his patent being set aside by a court on that ground.

It may be observed in this place that, by the Government Bill (clause 7), an appeal from the ruling of the examiners is to lie from the examiners and their superior, the comptroller, to the law officer; and that, by the Society of Arts' Bill (clause 12), an appeal is to lie to the commissioners. The latter Bill also provides that an adverse decision on the point of subject-matter is not to be fatal to the application, but that the patent may be granted, subject to an indorsement on the patent of the decision having been adverse.

The fact that the 6th section of the Statute of Monopolies is repealed by the Society of Arts' Bill renders it necessary for patents to be excepted (clause 4) from that statute, and in defining for what matters patents may be granted, either the words of the old statute—viz., "any manner of new manufactures within this realm"—have to be employed, or else some new definition has to be supplied. The line taken by the Bill is to attempt a new definition under five heads, of which the first is "any manner of manufacture," and it is clear that much time and skill has been employed in devising this new definition; but, in our opinion, it is a mistake to attempt to improve upon a definition which has remained untouched for nearly 300 years, and which has been interpreted by a long series of decisions. No new definition, however precise and accurate, can take the place of one so well established, until a vast amount of money and ingenuity has been expended upon it, and it is better either to adopt the Government plan of leaving the Statute of Monopolies, section 6, unrepealed, or, better, to repeal that section and re-enact it in the new Act, thus including in the new Act the basis on which it is founded.

Again, the Bill of the Society of Arts (clause 3) proposes to define novelty in a very novel way—viz., that it exists, where the invention has not been published or publicly used in the United Kingdom, the Channel Islands, or the Isle of Man, within the thirty years immediately preceding the application; and a proviso follows to the effect that there is not to be deemed to be publication unless a description has been published in some publication of which the last edition was issued within the thirty years. The definition is, of course, stated at much greater length and in more precise language than is stated above, but it certainly does seem that not only do the same remarks as those with respect to the attempted definition of subject-matter apply to the attempted definition of novelty, but that a new and decidedly objectionable principle is proposed to be introduced in the latter respect. A suggestion of value may be contained in a treatise or essay published, say, in the year 1851—the year of the Great Exhibition—that is more than thirty years ago, but the book may well be procurable at dozens of old bookstalls, and, as the law stands at present, anyone who buys the book may after working out the suggestions contained in it, use them for his own profit. And why not? The author has made an addition to the stock of public knowledge, and what reason can possibly be produced why the public should not avail themselves of the present thus

made to them? Yet the proposal of the Society's Bill is that some fine day a patent should be granted to some one who had done nothing more than read the book, or perhaps made some insignificant addition to the idea therein contained, and that from that date the sole benefit of the idea should, throughout the whole term of the patent, be appropriated by the man who had invented nothing, to the injury of the real inventor, as well as of all others who might otherwise equally appreciate the value of the suggestion in the book. This proposal differs *in toto* from the case of the re-discovery of a lost art, and it would be very unfortunate if it were adopted.

All these Bills (Government Bill, clause 14; Society of Arts' Bill, clause 11; Mr. Anderson's Bill, clause 9) agree in giving provisional protection after delivery of the provisional specification, but the Government Bill only gives it in cases where the application is accepted, and the duration is for the period between application and sealing, which may be fifteen months (clause 12); the Society of Arts' Bill gives it for nine months certain from the application, capable of extension to twelve months (clause 43), and the third Bill for twelve months from that date. Of course, the real question is what period ought to be allowed for maturing the invention and obtaining the actual grant, and in this respect it is clearly in the interest of inventors to accept the fifteen months offered by the first Bill, but it is only right that the condition imposed by the first Bill should be insisted on, since otherwise protection might be given for the limited period to an invention which a very cursory examination proved not to possess the elements most obviously necessary to entitle its supposed possessor to a patent.

SOME MISCELLANEOUS POINTS IN THE GOVERNMENT BANKRUPTCY BILL.

Distress for Rent in Case of Bankruptcy.

In moving the second reading of the Government Bankruptcy Bill, Mr. Chamberlain called attention to the fact that it is not proposed by the Bill to re-enact the priority given to Crown debts, to rates, and to rent by the present Bankruptcy Act. With respect to Crown debts and rates we have very little to say, as it may not be unfair that the Crown and the parochial authorities should be placed upon the same footing as ordinary creditors, and probably the chief result will be to make the different collectors of taxes and rates look a little sharper after the payment thereof and be less indulgent than heretofore. But, with regard to rent, we apprehend from what was stated by several speakers on the second reading that the proposal will not pass without great opposition in Committee, and it will not be out of place to consider what the effect of the proposal may be. The change is proposed to be brought about by the simple omission from the Bill of section 34 of the Act of 1869 or any similar provision. That section is as follows: "The landlord, or other person to whom any rent is due from the bankrupt, may, at any time, either before or after the commencement of the bankruptcy, distrain upon the goods or effects of the bankrupt for the rent due to him from the bankrupt, with this limitation, that if such distress for rent be levied after the commencement of the bankruptcy, it shall be available only for one year's rent accrued due prior to the date of the order of adjudication, but the landlord, or other person to whom the rent may be due from the bankrupt, may prove under the bankruptcy for the overplus due for which the distress may not have been available." Our readers will probably remember that in the Bill of 1881 a clause was included upon the same point, which was to take the place of section 34. That clause was as follows: "A landlord shall not, after a person has been adjudicated bankrupt, distrain or proceed with a distress for rent due from him before the adjudication, but may, with the leave of the court, and on proof that the tenancy has been continued for the benefit of the bankrupt's estate, distrain for rent which has accrued due since the adjudication." On the other hand, by the Bill introduced by Mr. Barran at the instance of the Association of Chambers of Commerce of the United Kingdom last session, the only alteration proposed in section 34 was to reduce the time for which a landlord's right to distrain after the commencement of a bankruptcy would continue from twelve months to six months. In the Bill introduced by Mr. Dixon-Hartland last session, the clause in the Government Bill of 1881 was adopted without alteration, but that appears to have been done because, as we suggested at the time, the promoters of that Bill had not fully considered its effect, inasmuch as the clause has been omitted from Mr. Dixon-Hartland's Bill of the present session (which would have the effect of leaving section 34 unaltered, if such an amending Bill only were passed), and Mr. Dixon-Hartland also, in speaking on the second reading of the Government Bill, took exception to the Government proposal. We commented upon these proposals at some length in the last volume of the Solicitors' Journal (vol. 26, pp. 195, 383, 399), and we suggested that the Government proposal of 1881 went too far in one direction and not far enough in another. The same remark, we think, applies, with even stronger force, to the present proposal.

On the one hand, if a landlord does not distrain until after an act of bankruptcy has been committed, to which a trustee's title would relate back—or, at all events, until after the making of a receiving order or the committing of an act of bankruptcy of which he has notice—he will be deprived of his preferential right by way of distress for any amount whatever. This, in our opinion, is going further than it is wise to do, but that, of course, is a matter of opinion, and those who think that the law of distress ought to be abolished altogether will view the proposal with satisfaction. We have put the three alternative periods of an act of bankruptcy being committed to which a trustee's title would relate back, the making of a receiving order, and the committing of an act of bankruptcy of which the landlord has notice, although, in our opinion, the first-mentioned of such periods is correct, for the following reasons. Clause 9, sub-clause 1, provides that, on the making of a receiving order, "no creditor to whom the debtor is indebted in respect of any debt proveable in bankruptcy shall have any remedy against the property or person of the debtor in respect of the debt except with the leave of the court and on such terms as the court may impose." This clearly would include a landlord's claim for rent and his remedy by distress under clauses 33 and 39, and the interpretation of the word "property" in clause 157. Then, by clause 38, it is provided that the bankruptcy of a debtor shall relate back to the committing of an act of bankruptcy within six months, which, but for clause 44, would avoid all transactions whatever with respect to the property of a bankrupt after the date of such act of bankruptcy being committed. Clause 44, however, whilst protecting "any execution against the goods of a bankrupt executed by seizure and sale" before the date of the receiving order, and several other transactions therein specified, if the party to the transaction other than the debtor had not at the time notice of an act of bankruptcy committed by the bankrupt, and available for grounding a receiving order against him, omits all mention of a distress by a landlord. The result, therefore, as it appears to us, would be to deprive a landlord who distrained for rent before the making of a receiving order, but after the committing of an act of bankruptcy, though without notice thereof, of the protection of that clause. Even then, if the Legislature should approve of the general proposal, we think that, subject to the further suggestions we propose to make, a distress duly completed by sale of the goods should have the same protection given to it as an execution completed by seizure and sale.

But, on the other hand, we think the proposal is not sufficient to remedy the evils of the present law in the case of a landlord distraining for a large arrear of rent before any act of bankruptcy has been committed. In such case, even though before a petition is filed or even a receiving order is made, he may not have sold under the distress, we think he would, immediately upon the levying of the distress by seizure, become a secured creditor in the same way that it has been held under the present Act that an execution against a trader for less than £50, or against a non-trader for any amount levied by seizure alone, constitutes the execution creditor a secured creditor under the Act (*Ex parte Rocke, Re Hall*, 19 W. R. 1129, L. R. 6 Ch. 795; *Slater* v. *Pinder*, 19 W. R. 778, L. R. 6 Ex. 228, and 7 Ex. 95). The interpretation clause of the Bill (clause 157) provides that "'secured creditor' means a person holding a mortgage, *charge*, or lien on the property of the debtor, or any part thereof, as a security for a debt due to him from the debtor," which is substantially the same as sub-section 5 of section 16 of the present Act, so that the cases upon the wording of that Act would equally apply to the clause in the Bill if passed in its present form. If, then, a landlord who might seize under a distress before any act of bankruptcy should be committed would become a secured creditor within the meaning of the interpretation clause, he would come within the protection of sub-clause 2 of clause 9, which provides that "this section shall not affect the power of any secured creditor to realize or otherwise deal with his security in the same manner as he would have been entitled to realize or deal with it if this section had not been passed." There would be nothing, therefore, in the Bill to prevent him from completing his distress by sale of the property seized after a petition has been filed or a receiving order made, and from applying the proceeds thereof in liquidation of the whole amount for which he might have distrained, which, of course, might be for any period not barred by the Statute of Limitations. The proposal in the Bill of 1881, insufficient as it was in this respect, was still much better than the present one, as it provided against a landlord not only *distraining* after adjudication, but *proceeding with* a distress, which would meet such a case as we have suggested. But even that does not, we think, go far enough to meet such cases as may easily be foreseen as likely to happen, and we repeat the suggestion which we made in our comments upon the Bill of 1881, that a landlord distraining for more than a certain amount of arrears, and completing his distress by sale before any bankruptcy proceedings are instituted, should be placed, with regard to the amount of the distress beyond the limit of, say, six months, in a similar position to an execution creditor if a petition should be filed within a limited period from the completion of the distress.

Annulling Adjudications.

Clause 31 of the Bill contains provisions empowering a court to annul an adjudication of bankruptcy "where, in the opinion of the court, a debtor ought not to have been adjudged bankrupt, or where it is proved to the satisfaction of the court that the debts of the bankrupt are paid in full"; but no power is contained in the Bill, as in section 28 of the present Act, for the annulling of an adjudication in case of a composition being accepted by the creditors and confirmed by the court. In the Bill of 1881 provision was made for the annulling of a bankruptcy in the latter case also, and that power is retained in the Bill introduced by Mr. Dixon-Hartland. Special attention is directed to the omission of this power from the present Government Bill by the "Memorandum showing the general effect of the changes in the law proposed by the Bill," made in return to an order of the House of Commons, so that the alteration has been made after due consideration by the authorities who have charge of the Bill. By clause 28 certain disqualifications attaching to a bankrupt are enumerated, which can only be removed when either the adjudication against him is annulled, or he obtains his discharge, "with a certificate to the effect that his bankruptcy was caused by misfortune, without any misconduct on his part." But by clause 20, sub-clause 1, the creditors may, after adjudication, accept a composition or scheme in manner therein stated, "and thereupon the same proceedings shall be taken, *and the same consequences shall ensue*, as in the case of a composition or scheme before adjudication." One of the consequences of a composition or scheme without an adjudication is, that the debtor never comes within the disqualification clause at all, and we fail to see why a bankrupt who afterwards enters into a composition or scheme (approved by the court, as it must be just as much as a composition or scheme entered into without adjudication) should not be placed in the same position. It often happens that debtors are unable, in the time which they have before a first meeting is held, to obtain the necessary assistance to enable them to propose any composition or scheme, and so arrangements after adjudication or liquidation under section 28 of the present Act are very frequent, and we apprehend that the same difficulty will in the future be also experienced by debtors who may be able subsequently to make very satisfactory proposals to their creditors. If, then, the words which we have printed in italics are not sufficient in themselves to remove the disqualifications contained in clause 28 from a bankrupt who enters into a composition or scheme under clause 20 (which it is, however, we think, open to argument they would), then it will be necessary for a bankrupt in such a case also to obtain a formal discharge from the court, with a certificate to the effect mentioned in clause 28, before his disqualifications will cease. Considering the stringent rules laid down for the guidance of the court in granting or withholding its approval of a composition or scheme, we think this provision altogether unnecessary, and that it would be an improvement if either the power to annul in case of the acceptance of a composition or scheme after adjudication were re-inserted in the Bill, or a provision were inserted in clause 28 making the carrying out of such a composition or scheme have the effect of removing the disqualifications enumerated in that clause. On the subject of clause 31 we would also call attention to the words "where, in the opinion of the court, a debtor ought not to have been adjudged bankrupt." These words appear to give a wide discretion to the court, but we apprehend that it will be a discretion which must be exercised judicially and which will be subject to appeal. There appear to be no provisions in the Bill to explain under what circumstances it is meant that a debtor adjudged bankrupt ought not to have been so adjudged, unless it be sub-clause 3 of clause 7, which provides that on the hearing of a bankruptcy petition, "if the court is not satisfied with the proof of the petitioning creditor's debt, or is not satisfied that the debtor is unable to pay his debts, the court may dismiss the petition." We have already called attention to that provision (*supra*, p. 307), and will not repeat our objections to it here. We quote it now only to suggest whether it is intended that if the court should be afterwards satisfied that a debtor might have been able to pay his debts, if he had not been adjudged bankrupt, this would be a sufficient ground on which it could annul the bankruptcy. It would, in our opinion, be more reasonable to omit that part of clause 31 altogether, as it is most vague and unsatisfactory, and to substitute the acceptance of a composition or scheme approved by the court as a ground upon which the court should be empowered to annul.

"Bankruptcy Notice."

Bankruptcy proceedings by way of debtor's summons are proposed to be abolished by the Bill, and in lieu thereof it is proposed that a debtor shall commit an act of bankruptcy "if the petitioning creditor has obtained final judgment in an action against him for any amount, and has served on him in England, or, by leave of the court, elsewhere, a bankruptcy notice under this Act, requiring him to pay the judgment debt in accordance with the terms of the judgment, or to secure or compound for it to the satisfaction of the petitioner or the court, and he does not, within *three days* after service of the notice, in case the notice is effected in England, and in case the notice is effected elsewhere, then within the time limited in that behalf by the order giving leave to effect the service, either comply with the requirements of this notice or satisfy the court that he has a counter-claim, set-off, or cross-demand which equals or exceeds the amount of the judgment debt, and which he could not set up in the action in which the judgment was obtained." The foregoing is sub-clause 1 (*f.*) of clause 4 of the Bill; and by sub-clause 2 of the same clause it is further provided: "A bankruptcy notice under this Act shall be in the prescribed form, and shall state the consequences of non-compliance therewith, and shall be served in the prescribed manner." This proposal is substantially the same as was contained in the Bill of 1881, but there are several alterations in it from the previous proposal. First, the debtor is to secure or compound for the debts "to the satisfaction of the petitioner *or the court*," the words in italics not appearing in the Bill of 1881. Then *three* days are substituted for *fourteen* days, and the alternative of satisfying the court that he has a counter-claim, &c., with which paragraph (*f.*) concludes, does not appear in the former Bill. The form and wording of the paragraph are also different from those of the former Bill, but the three alterations which we have pointed out are the only ones in substance. In considering this proposal it is important to bear in mind that, under the present Act, proceedings by debtor's summons, and an execution levied by seizure and sale against a trader for not less than £50, where the debtor has goods which may be so levied upon, are the only means which creditors have of compelling a debtor to commit an act of bankruptcy. Proceedings by debtor's summons, there is no doubt, are now often improperly taken, and, as the law at present exists, they are certainly unsatisfactory in many respects, so that an amendment of them is very desirable. The chief objection to the proposal of 1881 was the length of time which would necessarily elapse between the issuing of a writ by a creditor, which would be the initiatory proceeding for the purpose of serving a bankruptcy notice, and the time when the act of bankruptcy would become complete by the failure to pay; but this will be, to a great extent, remedied by the reduction of the fourteen days then proposed to three days, as now proposed. With regard to the introduction of the words "or the court," however, we do not think the proposal at all a wise one. A creditor ought not, in our opinion, to be compelled by the court to accept any security or composition for his debt in default of payment thereof. The proposal is entirely new and contrary to the principles which have heretofore actuated the Legislature upon this point, and we apprehend, moreover, that a court would hesitate before taking upon itself to order a creditor to be satisfied with anything less than actual payment of the amount. Then, with regard to the alternative with which the paragraph concludes, considering that the Judicature Acts allow any sort of cross-demand to be set up as a defence or counter-claim in an action, this provision might appear unnecessary. The only case where it would apply, as it appears to us, would be where the cross-demand consisted of a debt not due at the time of the action, but which might become due after judgment. It may be necessary to provide for such a case, but we are inclined to doubt the necessity. However, the proposal is not likely to work any injury, so that the most that can probably be said about it is that it is surplusage. Upon the proposal generally, we think that a bankruptcy notice ought to be limited to such an amount as would constitute a petitioning creditor's debt, as in the case of a debtor's summons under the present Act. It will be seen that the notice must be in respect of a judgment obtained by *the petitioning creditor*, so that, we take it, only in case where a creditor obtains judgment for a portion of his debt less than £50, but having a debt of not less than that amount, though the remainder might not be payable immediately, would there be any alteration of the present law in this respect. But is it desirable to give a creditor so situated a power upon failure to pay a sum less than fifty pounds to present a bankruptcy petition in respect of his whole debt? We can only say that we doubt the policy of it. On the clause in its present form the further question may arise whether, in case of the failure of a judgment debtor to pay his creditor after being served with a bankruptcy notice, a sum less than fifty pounds, and the creditor not having any other sum payable to him from the debtor, "either immediately, or at some certain future time," this would constitute an act of bankruptcy upon which the judgment creditor and another creditor, for a sum sufficient to make up the necessary petitioning creditor's debt, could present a petition. Probably it would not, inasmuch as the provision being in the nature of a penalty, it would have to be construed strictly; but the point is, notwithstanding, open to considerable doubt, and it would be well, if the principle of allowing a bankruptcy notice to be served in respect of a judgment debt for any amount be adhered to, so to word the clause as to put it beyond doubt by inserting after the word "creditor," in the first line, the words "or one of the petitioning creditors."

Transfer of Proceedings.

Power is given by sub-section 5 of section 80 of the Bankruptcy Act, 1869, to the creditors in a bankruptcy in any local bankruptcy court by special resolution to transfer the proceedings in the bankruptcy to the London court, or to some other local court. This power is often acted upon and is much appreciated in cases where a debtor is adjudicated a bankrupt or files a petition in a court other than where the creditors, as a body, reside, and we think any contraction of the power will be a mistake. In addition to this power being vested in creditors, provision is

also made for proceedings to be similarly transferred "where the judge of a local court certifies that, in his opinion, the bankruptcy would be more advantageously conducted in the London court or in some other local court, and the creditors do not by resolution object to the transfer." The rules regulating the practice in such cases are rules 82—84 with regard to bankruptcy, but a separate rule (No. 288) is provided in liquidation or composition proceedings, the latter rule only referring to the power of the creditors to transfer, and being silent respecting the power of the court. That rule, read by itself, would also seem to imply that an ordinary resolution would be sufficient for the purpose, the words being, "the creditors assembled at any general meeting may include in their resolution a direction," &c., but we apprehend that those words must be read in conjunction with sub-section 5 of section 80, which requires the resolution to be a special one. Upon the question of the proper court in which a petition must be filed, and the power to transfer, some important changes are proposed by the Government Bankruptcy Bill. By clause 87 a return to the provisions of the Act of 1849—substituting the courts now having jurisdiction in bankruptcy matters for the old courts of bankruptcy—is proposed, the court to have original jurisdiction being that in which the debtor has resided or carried on business for the longest period during the six months immediately preceding the presentation of the petition, instead of the court where he resides or carries on business at the time of the presentation. This we consider a very sensible change, as there have been several cases of debtors leaving the districts where they have contracted their debts and going to reside in distant places for the express purpose of being able to file their petitions there. On the question of power to transfer also, an important change is proposed by sub-clause 2 of clause 89 of the Bill; but this change we do not, if we read the sub-clause aright, approve of. The sub-clause is as follows:—"Any proceedings in bankruptcy may at any time, and at any stage thereof, and either with or without application from any of the parties thereto, be transferred *by any prescribed authority*, and in the prescribed manner, from one court to another court, or may, by the like authority, be retained in the court in which the proceedings were commenced, although it may not be the court in which the proceedings ought to have been commenced." It will be seen that nothing is said in the sub-clause as to the creditors being able to transfer proceedings by special resolution, but it may be that the Lord Chancellor and the President of the Board of Trade, under the clause enabling them to make general rules (clause 119), and the definition of the word "prescribed" in clause 157, would be able, by reason of the words "by any prescribed authority," to give this power to the creditors as they have it under the present Act. Now, we think that such a power ought not to be left to the absolute discretion of the authorities who will have the framing of the rules, but that it should be specially given to the creditors by the Bill itself. Where transfers are made under the present Act they are, we think we are right in saying, invariably so made by resolution of creditors; certainly, in our experience, we do not know of a single case where the judge of any court has taken the initiative in the matter. It might, in fact, be considered that a judge who did so act would be influenced by a desire to shirk the work, and, at any rate, we have no doubt that judges, as a rule, feel a delicacy in so acting, lest their actions might be so construed. Unless, therefore, it is made clear that it is intended to give creditors, by general rules, power by special resolution to transfer proceedings, we think it would be wise to insert such a power in the Bill.

CORRESPONDENCE.

SOLICITORS' REMUNERATION ORDER.—PART II.

[*To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.*]

Sir,—Can any of your correspondents state what comes under the definition of "other long leases not at rack-rent"?

The term for a building lease varies from sixty to ninety-nine years. That for an ordinary lease at rack-rent does not generally exceed twenty-one years.

But it constantly happens that a lessor, in consideration of an outlay for repairs, grants a lease at a reduced rent for, say, *thirty* years, and upwards.

Would such be considered a long lease not at rack-rent?

April 4. SUBSCRIBER.

[In the case supposed the rent reserved is not the full annual value of the premises demised, and the lease is therefore clearly not at rack-rent. But whether a lease for only thirty years would be considered as coming within the term "*other* long leases" is, we think, doubtful. The expression is capable of being construed as "other leases of the length usual in building leases." If this construction is adopted the following result will ensue: (1) Leases at a rack-rent (other than mining and building leases) are to be charged for according to the first scale. (2) Building leases reserving rent and *long* leases not at rack-rent (except mining leases) are to be charged for according to the second scale. (3) Leases not at rack-rent and not being long leases are to be charged for under the present system as altered by schedule 2.—ED. *S. J.*]

CASES OF THE WEEK.

APPEAL—SECURITY FOR COSTS—WINDING-UP ORDER—APPEAL BY COMPANY—ORD. 58, R. 15—COMPANIES ACT, 1862, S. 110.—In a case of *In re The Photographic Artists' Co-operative Supply Association*, before the Court of Appeal on the 3rd inst., the question arose whether, when a company alone appeals from an order to wind it up, security should be given for the costs of the appeal. Chitty, J., made an order for the compulsory winding up of the above company, on the ground that it was insolvent. An appeal from the order was presented in the name of the company alone, and the respondent (the petitioner for the winding-up order) then applied to the Court of Appeal for an order that security should be given for the costs of the appeal. In support of the application reliance was placed on some observations made by JAMES, L.J., in *In re The Diamond Fuel Company* (28 W. R. 309, L. R. 13 Ch. D. 400). In that case a company alone appealed from an order for its winding up, and no application for security for the costs of the appeal had been made before the hearing of the appeal. On the hearing the appeal was dismissed, and the Court of Appeal ordered that the respondent's costs of the appeal should be paid out of the company's assets, but made no order as to the costs of the appellants. JAMES, L.J., said (L. R. 13 Ch. D. 412), "We can give no further order than that which was made in *In re National Savings Bank Association* (L. R. 1 Ch. 547), that all parties except the appellants shall have their costs out of the estate, and there will be no order as to the costs of the appellants. We desire it to be understood that for the future, whenever an order absolute for winding up a company has been made, and that order is appealed from by the company itself, without any one else being made responsible for costs, we shall be ready to entertain an application for security for costs." Against the application for security it was urged that there was no precedent for requiring it in such a case beyond the above *dictum* of JAMES, L.J.; that the respondent would be sufficiently protected by the power of the court to make the order as to costs which was made in *In re The Diamond Fuel Company*; and that the evidence showed that the funds in the hands of the liquidator were ample to provide for the respondents' costs of the appeal. The Court of Appeal (BAGGALLAY and COTTON, L.JJ.), held that security to the extent of £25 must be given. BAGGALLAY, L.J., said that the effect of ordering the costs of the respondent, if successful, to be paid out of the company's assets would be to pay them out of the fund which ought to go for the benefit of the creditors. It appeared to him that the general principle enunciated by JAMES, L.J., in *In re The Diamond Fuel Company* was right. He thought that, as a general rule, when a company was the only appellant from a winding-up order security ought to be given for the costs of the appeal. There might, of course, be special circumstances which would take the case out of the general rule. COTTON, L.J., said that the winding-up order was made on the ground that the company was unable to pay its debts, and on the present application this must be taken as, at any rate, *primâ facie* evidence that the company was insolvent. It was said that the costs of the respondent could be dealt with by the court under section 110 of the Companies Act, 1862, as costs of the winding up. His lordship thought that they might. But the question was whether, if the court had a power by which it could provide for those costs in another way, it ought not to exercise it. In *In re The Diamond Fuel Company* that question did not arise, for no application had been made for security before the hearing of the appeal. In the present case this application had been made in order that the court might not be compelled to throw the respondent's costs on the company's assets if the appeal should be unsuccessful. In his lordship's opinion, when an order was made to wind up a company on the ground of its insolvency, those who put the company in motion to appeal from the order ought to give security for costs, so that if the appeal was unsuccessful the respondent's costs might not be thrown on the assets to the injury of the creditors. He would lay down the general rule as Baggallay, L.J., had done, but with a qualification to which he was sure that learned judge would assent, that when an order had been made to wind up a company *on the ground that it was unable to pay its debts*, if the company alone appealed from the order, security ought to be given for the costs of the appeal.—SOLICITORS, *Barnard & Co.; A. R. & H. Steele.*

PRACTICE—DISCOVERY—FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH ORDER—DISMISSAL OF ACTION FOR WANT OF PROSECUTION—ORD. 31, R. 20.—In a case of *Danvillier v. Myers*, before the Court of Appeal on the 4th inst., the question arose under what circumstances the court ought to exercise the power given to it by rule 20 of order 31, to dismiss an action for want of prosecution. Rule 20 provides that, "if any party fails to comply with any order to answer interrogatories, or for discovery or inspection of documents, he shall be liable to attachment. He shall also, if a plaintiff, be liable to have his action dismissed for want of prosecution, and, if a defendant, to have his defence, if any, struck out, and to be placed in the same position as if he had not defended, and the party interrogating may apply to the court or a judge for an order to that effect, and an order may be made accordingly." In the present case, the Court of Appeal (BAGGALLAY and COTTON, L.JJ.) affirmed an order of Chitty, J., dismissing the action for want of prosecution, on the ground that the plaintiff had failed to comply with an order for the discovery of documents. BAGGALLAY, L.J., said that such an order ought to be made only when the court was satisfied that the plaintiff was not acting *bonâ fide*, and it was the duty of the judge to satisfy himself as to the general conduct and behaviour of the plaintiff in the action. In the present case his lordship was of opinion that the plaintiff's conduct had been of this nature. COTTON, L.J., thought that, though power was given to the judge to dismiss an action for want of prosecu-

tion because of the plaintiff's non-compliance with an order for discovery, the judge ought not to exercise the power, but to allow the plaintiff a further opportunity for making the discovery required, unless he was satisfied that the plaintiff had been trying to avoid making fair discovery. Before exercising this power the judge must be satisfied that there was something like a desire to avoid giving the discovery—a desire to keep back some information in the plaintiff's possession. Unless the court was satisfied of this it ought not to make an order dismissing the action for want of prosecution.—SOLICITORS, *Crook & Carlill; G. S. & H. Brandon.*

DOMICILE—ENGLISH SUBJECTS IN CHINA—"ANGLO-CHINESE"—ANGLO-INDIAN DOMICILE—LEGACY DUTY.—In the case of *In re Tootal's Trusts*, before Chitty, J., for judgment on the 4th inst., a petition was presented for the distribution of a fund paid into court by the executors of the will of J. B. Tootal, who died at Shanghai, in the Empire of China, in the year 1878, and the question involved was whether a native of this country could acquire by residence in China a new domicile so as to exempt his personal estate on death from the operation of the Legacy Duty Acts, it being contended that natives of this country could acquire a domicile in China which might be called Anglo-Chinese, being like that in India, called Anglo-Indian. The testator—who, at the time of his death, had taken up his permanent abode at Shanghai, where he was the owner of several newspapers and a partner in a printing business, and which place he had expressed his intention of never leaving—by his will, which was proved in the Supreme Court of China and Japan at Shanghai, bequeathed property both to persons residing in China, including at least one Chinese subject, and also to persons residing in England. Assets having been forwarded by the executors for distribution amongst the English legatees, legacy duty was claimed by the Commissioners of Inland Revenue in respect of the whole personalty of the testator, and the sum transmitted for distribution was paid into court to abide the determination of the question. CHITTY, J., said that the liability of the personal estate of a deceased person to pay legacy duty depended on his domicile at death. It was contended that there existed at the foreign port of Shanghai an organized community of British subjects independent of Chinese law and exempt from Chinese jurisdiction, and not amenable to the ordinary tribunals of this country, but bound together by law which was English law, no doubt, but English law with the difference that the English Revenue laws did not form part of it, and that, by residence and choice, the testator became a member of this community, and, as such, acquired an Anglo-Chinese domicile. The authorities cited in support of this contention for an Anglo-Chinese domicile related to the Anglo-Indian domicile of persons in the covenanted service of the East India Company. These authorities were generally admitted to be anomalous (Dicey on Domicile, pp. 140, 141, and 337). They were explained by Lord Hatherley in his judgment in *Forbes* v. *Forbes* (Kay, 536), and by Turner, L.J., in *Jopp* v. *Wood* (4 D. J. & S. 616). The observation of Turner, L.J., that the East India Company was regarded as a foreign Government, was material. That learned judge had said, in *Jopp* v. *Wood* (p. 623), at the time when those cases [*i.e.*, the cases on Anglo-Indian domicile] were decided the Government of the East India Company was in a great degree, if not wholly, a separate and independent Government, foreign to the Government of this country, and it may well have been thought that persons who had contracted obligations with such Government for service abroad could not reasonably be considered to have intended to retain their domicile here. They, in fact, became as much estranged from this country as if they had become servants of a foreign "Government." Lord Stowell, in his judgment in *The Indian Chief* (3 Rob. 12, p. 28), showed that in his time the sovereignty of the Great Mogul over the British territories in India was merely nominal, being, as he said, occasionally brought forward for purposes of policy, and that the actual authority of Government over those territories was exercised with full effect by this country and the East India Company, a creature of this country. His observation as to the authority of the Government being exercised by this country was not really inconsistent with the passage cited from the judgment of Turner, L.J., for although the Government of British India was English, being carried on principally by the agency of the chartered company, it was for all practical purposes a distinct Government from that of Great Britain, and in that sense it was, as Turner, L.J., said, regarded as a foreign Government. At Shanghai there was a British Consul residing there by virtue of treaties, but there was no Government by British authority existing there, and there was nothing which could be regarded as a separate or independent Government, and the analogy which the petitioner sought to establish with an Anglo-Indian domicile was not made out. There was no principle upon which such a domicile could be established. The British community at Shanghai, such as it was, resided on foreign territory. It was not a British colony, nor even a Crown colony, although by the treaties, Acts of Parliament, and Orders in Council regulating the relations of this country with its subjects in China, the Crown had, as between itself and its own subjects there, a jurisdiction similar to that exercised in a conquered or ceded territory. There might be, and indeed were, numerous examples of particular sects or communities residing within a territory governed by particular laws especially applicable to them. British India afforded a familiar illustration of this. But the special laws applicable to such sects or communities were not laws of their own enactment. They were merely parts of the law of the governing community or supreme power. It might be that a Hindoo or Mussulman settling in British India, and attaching himself to his own religious sect there, would acquire an Anglo-Indian domicile, and by virtue of such domicile would enjoy the civil *status* as to marriage inheritance and the like, accorded by the laws of British India to Hindoos or Mussulmans, and such civil *status* would differ materially from that of a European settling there and attaching himself to the British community; but the civil *status* of the Hindoo, the Mussulman, and the European would in each case be regulated by the law of the supreme territorial power. In the present case the contention was for a domicile which might not improperly be termed extra-territorial. The sovereignty over the soil at Shanghai remained vested in the Emperor of China, with the exception that he had by treaty bound himself to permit British subjects to reside at the place for the purposes of commerce only, without interference on his part, and to permit the British Crown to exercise jurisdiction there over its own subjects, but over no other persons. According to the petitioner's argument, subjects of all the Sovereign States who enjoyed similar treaty privileges might acquire, under circumstances similar to those in the present case, a new domicile of choice. If, for instance, a citizen of the United States were to reside at Shanghai with the intention of remaining there permanently, and were to attach himself, so far as he could, to one of the European communities there—for instance, to the British community—he would, according to the petitioner's contention, have lost his domicile of origin, and have acquired an Anglo-Chinese domicile which, for most practical purposes, would be equivalent to an English domicile. His lordship was of opinion that he would not acquire such a domicile. The jurisdiction conferred on the Supreme Court at Shanghai was merely the jurisdiction of her Majesty, exerciseable in China and confined to British subjects. It was non-exclusive, and did not oust the jurisdiction of her Majesty's courts in England. The only distinction between this case and *Maltass* v. *Maltass* (1 Robertson's Ecc. Rep., p. 67) was the existence at Shanghai of an English Court of Probate. Similar courts, however, existed in the Ottoman dominion and in Egypt, and, in fact, all those courts were consular courts, or constituted on the same model, with more or less jurisdiction. His lordship, therefore, held that there was no such thing known to the law as an Anglo-Chinese domicile; that the testator's domicile remained English; and that the circumstances were not sufficient to create any exception from the broad principle that legacy duty was payable where the domicile was British. There would, therefore, be a declaration that duty was payable in respect of the whole of the testator's estate.—SOLICITORS, *The Solicitor to the Inland Revenue; Johnson & Master; Clayton, Son, & Fargus; Frankish & Buchanan.*

SOCIETIES.

LAW ASSOCIATION.

At the usual monthly meeting of the directors, held at the hall of the Incorporated Law Society, Chancery-lane, on Thursday, the 5th of April, the following being present—viz., Mr. Desborough (chairman), and Messrs. Boodle, Burges, Collisson, Styan, Williamson, and A. B. Carpenter (secretary)—the annual general court was fixed for Thursday, the 31st of May, and the ordinary general business was transacted.

LAW UNION FIRE AND LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY.

The annual general meeting was held on the 29th ult., under the presidency of Mr. James Cuddon, the chairman.

The notice convening the meeting having been read by Mr. FRANK MCGEDY, the actuary and secretary, the minutes of the last annual meeting were read and confirmed as correct. The report of the directors and statement of accounts were taken as read.

REPORT.

The directors submit to the shareholders the accounts of the company for the financial year ended the 30th of November, 1882, and their report thereon.

The new insurances for the year, in the fire department, were 6,646 in number, and amounted to £6,001,464, yielding in new premiums the sum of £7,259 6s. 9d. In the life department 235 new policies were issued, insuring the sum of £213,965, the new premiums upon which amounted to £8,065 3s. 6d., of which £593 4s. 5d. was paid away on re-assurances for £19,900.

Twenty-five life annuities were granted for £2,032 15s. 4d. per annum, the purchase-money for which amounted to £21,388 2s. 4d. Thirteen annuitants died during the year, resulting in the falling in of annuities to the amount of £928 1s. 10d. per annum.

The net amount of life claims in the year was £48,745 13s. 8d., as against £37,099 1s. 10d. in the previous year.

In common with nearly every fire insurance office in the kingdom, the losses in the fire department of the company for the past year have been above the average; they amounted to £17,999 0s. 11d., being 47 per cent. of the net premiums, as against 25 per cent. in 1881.

The total number of policies in force in the life department at the close of the year was 3,282, insuring the sum of £2,826,019 (including bonus additions).

The gross receipts for the year were £180,607 4s., inclusive of purchase-money received for granting annuities.

The average rate of interest obtained on the invested assets of the company during the year was £4 9s. 4d. per cent., free of income-tax.

In the life department the excess of receipts over expenditure for the year was £48,582 19s., by which sum the life assurance fund has been increased.

The total receipts of the fire department (less re-insurance) were £39,621 1s. 5d., and the total payments amounted to £29,780 8s. 11d.,

leaving a surplus on the year's account of £9,840 12s. 6d., of which one-fifth—viz., £1,968 2s. 6d.—has, in compliance with the deed of settlement, been carried to reserve fund, and the remainder to profit and loss account, making the balance at credit of that account £30,636 18s. 3d. The directors recommend that the sum of £15,000 be appropriated therefrom in payment of a dividend of 25 per cent. on the paid-up capital of the company for the year ending the 30th of November, 1883, leaving at credit of the profit and loss account the sum of £15,636 18s. 3d.

The CHAIRMAN then said: Gentlemen, before moving the adoption of the report, I will, with your permission, make a few explanatory remarks. In considering the accounts now before us it is well that we should remember that during two years preceding the one under review we had in the fire department an extraordinary—indeed, an unprecedently—low percentage of loss, amounting to no more than twenty-five per cent. of the premium income. It is, of course, quite out of the question to expect a continuance of any such good fortune. On the other hand, during the past year the average percentage of loss has been forty-seven per cent., representing a very material increase upon the figures of the two previous years. Putting, however, the three years together, the average percentage of loss is very low, amounting to no more than thirty-three per cent.; and I may add that I have taken the trouble to calculate the average percentage of loss on premium income since the office was established twenty-eight years ago, and there is not a very great deal of difference between that average and the forty-seven per cent. of last year. This difference ought to make us remember that it is of the very essence of an insurance business to depend upon averages, and not on the result of any particular year's operations. We should not, therefore, be unduly elated by sunshine, nor discouraged by being caught in a passing shower, nor depressed even by a continuance for a time of rainy weather. The effect of these circumstances has been simply this—that this year we have not gained so much as we should have liked; and I am afraid that the same remark equally applies to all other fire offices in the United Kingdom, because, as it is well known to everyone present, the fires of the past year have been both numerous and of serious magnitude. Then, with regard to the dividend, we have happily remembered the good old adage, "Make hay while the sun shines," and accordingly we have, on several occasions, reserved from the realized profits of good years a certain proportion of the earnings, with the express object of sustaining thereout the usual dividend in any subsequent year when the profits of that particular year did not suffice to pay it unassisted. But looking to the dividend of twenty-five per cent., which we now propose to declare, if we take into consideration, as we must do, the interest on the share capital as well as the amount of the profits of the year from the fire department, you will find that in point of fact we really trench very little indeed upon the sum of money which we have accumulated in former years for the purpose to which I have referred. Further, if you take into account that on the last division of profits we carried to the profit and loss account the whole of the life profits belonging to the shareholders, and if we take the due proportion of those profits for one year, you will find that we shall scarcely touch at all the reserves I have mentioned. Nay, more, it is a source of great satisfaction to me, and I have no doubt it will be equally so to the shareholders likewise, that after paying our usual dividend we have, in fact, a sum of money in hand from past profits more than sufficient to pay the same dividend of twenty-five per cent. next year, without any reference whatever to the interest on the share capital during the current year, or to the fire profits during the same period, or to the interest on the reserve fund. It is, of course, immaterial whether the yearly return received by the shareholders is called by the name of dividend or bonus, as in either case the money gets into their pockets. Now, as a matter of fact, including the sums paid by way of bonus during the current quinquennium, the average yearly receipt has been, up to the close of the past year, inclusively, within a fraction of four shillings per share—equivalent to thirty-three per cent. on the paid-up capital. I am aware that there is a feeling amongst some of the shareholders, whose opinions are entitled to great weight, that the market value of their share property is not enhanced by the system of occasional bonuses as it ought to be, nor in the same proportion as it would be by the alternative of an equivalent increased yearly dividend. In 1884 a considerable bonus will be due to the shareholders, according to the provisions of the deed of settlement, from the division of a moiety of the fire profits reserved during the quinquennium—in fact, forming part of the fire fund of £41,968 2s. 6d. mentioned in the accounts before you, and the question as to which will be the preferable mode of dealing with the money constituting such bonus is one which may well be considered in the interval. Whatever may be the opinion of individuals, I am quite sure all will be glad, when the time has arrived, to adopt that view which the majority of the shareholders may deem most advantageous. Now, as to the life claims, though they are £10,000 and upwards in excess of of those in the preceding year (when they were £37,000), yet the larger sum of £48,745 for the past year is about £5,500 less than the actual expectation for the year. Here, again, the average becomes matter for consideration, and, putting the two last years together, it will be found that the claims have been on the average £10,000 less than the sum expected by the tables. And now with regard to the progress of the business itself, it should be remembered that there is no enlargement of figures by foreign business, and that we must look at our office as doing a steady home business, consisting partly of fire business (which we endeavour to confine, as far as possible, to the best kind of risks) and partly of life business, the new income from both departments combined generally exceeding, as a minimum of late years, £15,000 a year; and this year it also exceeds the sum of £15,000. Now, I am not intending to appear to grumble at that amount, an amount which has in it the germs of prosperity, but I wish to impress upon the shareholders the fact that owing to the great and increasing competition we really need their assistance to sustain that amount. I believe, however, that the shareholders are perfectly well able, by very little attention not only to sustain, but materially increase that amount of new business, by which they would not only augment the average dividend I have spoken of, but also as a necessary consequence increase the bonuses on the life policies, which bonuses are, by the bye, already very good. In considering the amount of our new business we must not omit to look to the diminution of premium income through lapses of fire and life policies and surrenders of claims under life policies. In every yearly account it will be found that these items largely diminish what is called the renewal income. Increased profits can only be secured by increased business, and hence the importance of our not relaxing our efforts to improve the business. Some of the shareholders are, no doubt, interested as shareholders in other offices, but I ask a fair share even of their patronage. And, in conclusion, I desire to state distinctly and emphatically, that this office, which has funds in hand of upwards of three-quarters of a million sterling, and an income from premiums and interest of about £160,000 a-year, has all the elements of perfect security to the insured; and I further state that this office conducts its business liberally, honourably, and promptly, and therefore I say that upon its own merits it is entitled to your best support, which, I trust, and I am sure, you will give it. If no gentleman has any questions to ask, I will at once proceed to move the adoption of the report and accounts.

Mr. C. PEMBERTON, vice-chairman, seconded the resolution, and said that, after the exhaustive speech just delivered by the chairman, further comment was unnecessary.

The resolution was then put to the meeting and carried unanimously.

Mr. H. ROSCOE moved, Mr. A. R. OLDMAN seconded, and it was resolved unanimously, that a dividend of twenty-five per cent. per annum, free of income-tax, be paid to the shareholders for the financial year ending the 30th of November, 1883.

Mr. R. W. ROBERTS next moved the re-election of the retiring directors—viz., Sir John Lambert, K.C.B., and Messrs. G. M. Arnold, J. R. Buckton, S. H. Cooper, F. J, Coverdale, Basil Field, F. J. Keith, Henry Parker, T. W. Salmon, R. J. Sisson, C. A. Swinburne, and George Thomas.

On being seconded by Mr. W. W. ALDRIDGE, the resolutions were severally put and agreed to *nem. con.*

Mr. J. C. ASPREY moved, Mr. A. J. NORRIS seconded, and it was resolved, that Mr. Theodore Waterhouse be re-appointed the shareholders' auditor for the ensuing year.

The CHAIRMAN announced that, under the direction of the board, he had re-appointed Mr. Jas. J. Darley as directors' auditor for the year.

On the motion of Mr. A. CROSSMAN, seconded by Mr. W. DOWSON, the sum of seventy-five guineas was voted to each of the auditors.

EXTRAORDINARY GENERAL MEETING.

The CHAIRMAN explained that the present meeting had been convened for the purpose of effecting an alteration in the company's deed of settlement. The object of the proposed alterations was mainly to allow the management to invest money in the securities of any of the colonies or dependencies in the United Kingdom, and particularly as to reversionary life interests. It frequently happened that the estates which were being administered under will or settlements comprised a small part of foreign stocks, and it was exceedingly inconvenient to be obliged to refuse securities which were perfectly good of themselves simply because they were mixed up with securities of the kind mentioned. The second object sought by the proposed alteration was as to lending money on personal security covered by life insurance. These matters had been very much discussed by the board, and they had come to the conclusion that it would be advantageous on the whole that these alterations should be made. The chairman then formally moved the substitution of the new clause, No. 73, for that now existing.

Mr. C. PEMBERTON seconded the proposition, which was then unanimously agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN next moved a hearty vote of thanks to the actuary and secretary, the solicitor, and the other officers of the company, and, in doing so, dwelt in terms of high praise on the ability, assiduity, and attention displayed by every member of the staff.

Mr. PEMBERTON seconded the resolution, and said that the success of the company was, in chief measure, due to the admirable manner in which its officers had discharged their duties.

The resolution was warmly accorded.

Mr. F. MCGEDY briefly acknowledged the compliment on behalf of himself and brother officers.

On the motion of Mr. E. JAMES, a vote of thanks was passed to the chairman, who having replied, the proceedings closed.

Mr. Justice Fry is to be the new Lord Justice.

Mr. James Frederick Nokes, chief clerk of the Marlborough-street Police Court, has resigned, after twenty-seven years' service, owing to failing health.

In the House of Commons last week, Mr. A. Arnold asked the Secretary to the Treasury what was the total number and aggregate value of estates registered in the Office of Land Registry during the year ended the 31st of December, 1882. Mr. H. Gladstone said that the total number of dealings with estates at the Land Registry in the year 1882 was 648; and the value of those placed on the register (in the technical sense) was £1,103,000. But the number placed on the register for the first time was only fourteen, and their value about £120,000.

LAW STUDENTS' JOURNAL.

COUNCIL OF LEGAL EDUCATION.

EASTER EXAMINATION, 1883.

GENERAL EXAMINATION OF STUDENTS OF THE INNS OF COURT, held at Lincoln's-inn Hall, March 13, 14, 15, and 16, 1883.

The Council of Legal Education have awarded to the following students certificates that they have satisfactorily passed a public examination:—William Barnard, William Bentinck Balleine Brodrick, Harold Tarth Cerrington, John Marsh Dixon, Edward Snow Fordham, Howard Fowler, Tetley Gant, Clayton Louis Glyn, Frank Gore-Browne, Frederick Edward Grant Haines, Samuel Hirst, Gavin Fullarton James, George Morgan Edwardes Jones, William Trench Kirkpatrick, Hugh Martin Charters Macpherson, George Ebenezer Morrison, William Neill, Thomas Parnell Parnell, Sholto Rawlings Pemberton, Harry Rose Pugh, John Ramsay Reid, George Shedden, Reginald John Smith, Arthur Dudley Stallard, Henry Lacroix Temple, William Henry Trollope, William Howell Walters, Charles Arnold White, John Wood, William Leonard Wrenford, and John Edward Ivor Yale, of the Inner Temple; Jitendra Nath Banerjea, Walter Macgeough Bond, Charles Sidney Brandon, William Clark, Thomas Dale, Charles Shortt Dicken, Theodore John Fisher, John Alfred Foster, Henry Parkes Greenhow, Stanley Ismay, Samuel Kearns, Alan Kerr, Frederick Ninian Robert Laing, George Edward Lamplugh, Octave Camille Henri Laurent, Gerard Sunderland Leresche, Donald Mackinnon, Rokuashivo Masujima, Walter Maxwell, Andrew Agnew Stuart Menteath, George Thomas Morice, Reginald Burnett Morris, Otool Churn Mullick, and Kenrick Peck, of the Middle Temple; Thomas Atkinson Argles, Thomas Henry Attwater, Fanindra Bhaushan Chatterjea, Arthur Dudley Parr Dudley, Dhiraj Krishna Ghose, Arthur Richard Jennings, Alfred Percival Perceval Keep, Joseph Henry Warburton Lee, Herbert Morse, Tancred Earle Raven, James Scarlett, Ambrose Berry Walford, and Horace Newbegin Watts, of Lincoln's-inn; and Adalbert Ebenezer Hendrickson, of Gray's-inn, Esqs.

The following students passed a satisfactory examination in Roman law:—Frederic Aynsley, Frederic Goreil Barnes, Roander Albert Henry Bickford-Smith, Edward Francis Bigg, Archibald Henry Bodkin, John Lee Booker, Robert Weston Cracroft, Robert Sumner Curling, Harry Tenwarne Ede, Herbert George Fordham, Rockingham George Gill, John Andrew Hamilton, Henry William Johnston, Lleweyn Wynne Jones, George Washington Kilner, Henry Joseph Knowles, Pandit Shyamaji Krishnavarma, Arthur Lawrence, Francis George Montagu Mason, Hugh Mitchell, Edward John Chalmers Morton, John Rigby Murray, Thomas Phillips, Thomas Embray Davenport Philpot, Ernest Henry Railton, Frank Roheweger, Stewart Augustus Sillem, Arthur Edward Swift, Robert Hugh Wallace, Robert Benjamin Walmsley, and Aneurin Williams, of the Inner Temple; Octavius Beatty, Clarence Brandon, Robert Staunton Bunch, Thomas Dacres Butler, Arthur Herbert Davis, Rudolph James Van Ryck De Groot, Edward Maxwell Dillon, Henry Joseph Dillon, Gerald Aubrey Goodman, William Greenwood, Albert Charles Hayes, George Justus Liebig Hodges, Etienne Koenig, Robert Henry Logan, Frank Foster Long, James Macklin, Martial Louis Auguste Noel, Trevor John Chichele Plowden, Anandrao Harishankar Pradhan, Leslie Probyn, John Hugh McAuley Ryan, John Paul Rylands, Ardeshir Kavasju Sethna, Joseph Sharpe, Mill Stephenson, Edward George Ellis Stillwell, William Sutton, and Charles Tregenna, of the Middle Temple; and Hugh Aldersey, Algernon Cunliffe Bowring, Frederick Thomas Dalton, Willoughby Hyett Dickinson, Arthur Durandu, Khirode Behary Dutt, Charles Johnston Edwards, David William Fenn, John Hammond, Henry Henn, William Little, Hugh Pollock, Leonard Francis Potts, Frederick Single, Frederick Stroud, and Arthur Baldwin Woodcock, of Lincoln's-inn, Esqs.

Vice-Chancellor Bacon and Mr. Justice Fry have removed into the Royal Courts of Justice.

It is stated that the Lord Chief Justice has invited several leaders of the bar to accompany him on his visit to America in the autumn, and that amongst those who have accepted the invitation is Mr. Charles Russell, M.P.

At the Hertford Quarter Sessions, on Monday, the Marquis of Salisbury said the practice of policemen interrogating prisoners was a most objectionable one, and had been censured again and again. It was evidently not calculated to bring out the truth, especially as persons in the class of life from which prisoners were frequently drawn were apt to be confused when questioned by policemen. They had a great dread of policemen, and were apt to be put out by questions they did not fully understand, and thus they might be taken at a disadvantage before they had time to think. If it were the practice of the law in this country to have the evidence of the prisoners themselves, the evidence should be given before a jury, and presiding magistrates, and under the guidance of counsel. Then there would be some security that no advantage would be taken of prisoners. No such security existed when a police-constable questioned a prisoner. The practice of interrogating by policemen was calculated not to elicit truth, but falsehood. He had always tried to impress juries that evidence of that kind was evidence to which they should not attach the slightest importance.

LEGAL APPOINTMENTS.

The Right Hon. Sir WILLIAM BALLIOL BRETT, one of the judges of the Court of Appeal, has been appointed Master of the Rolls in succession to Sir George Jessel, deceased. Sir W. B. Brett is the son of the Rev. John George Brett, and was born in 1817. He was educated at Westminster and at Caius College, Cambridge, where he graduated as Junior Optime in 1839, and he was called to the bar at Lincoln's-inn in Hilary Term, 1846. He formerly practised on the Northern Circuit and in the Court of Admiralty. He became a Queen's Counsel in 1861, and he was elected M.P. for Helston in the Conservative interest in 1866. In February, 1868, he was appointed Solicitor-General and received the honour of knighthood, and in the following September he was appointed a puisne judge of the Court of Common Pleas. On the passing of the Appellate Jurisdiction Act, 1876, he was transferred to the Court of Appeal, and was sworn in as a member of the Privy Council.

Mr. THOMAS WILLIAM SNAGGE, barrister, has been appointed Judge of County Courts for Circuit No. 12, in succession to Mr. John de Longueville Giffard, who has succeeded the late Mr. Matthew Fortescue as judge of county courts for Circuit No. 58. Mr. Snagge is an M.A. of Trinity College, Dublin. He was called to the bar at the Middle Temple in Michaelmas Term, 1864. He has practised on the South-Eastern Circuit, and at the Essex and Hertford Sessions.

Mr. EDWARD WITHINSHAW HOLLINGSHEAD, solicitor (of the firm of Hollingshead & Moody), of Tunstall, Hanley, and Burslem, has been appointed Registrar of the Tunstall County Court (Circuit No. 26), in succession to Mr. Henry William Ackrill, deceased. Mr. Hollingshead was admitted a solicitor in 1870.

Mr. GEORGE FREDERICK ROUMIEU, barrister, has been elected Coroner for the Guildford Division of Surrey. Mr. Roumieu was educated at Jesus College, Cambridge, and he was called to the bar at Lincoln's-inn in May, 1880. He practises on the Western Circuit, and at the Hampshire, Winchester, Portsmouth, and Southampton Sessions.

Mr. ALFRED HENRY STONHOUSE VIGOR, barrister, has been appointed Recorder of the Borough of Southampton, in succession to Mr. Thomas Gunner, deceased. Mr. Vigor is a graduate of St. John's College, Cambridge. He was called to the bar at Lincoln's-inn in Michaelmas Term, 1860. He practises on the Western Circuit, and he has been for several years a revising barrister. He has been recorder of the borough of Penzance since 1876.

Mr. JAMES DICKINSON, Q.C., has been elected Treasurer of the Society of Lincoln's-inn in succession to the late Sir George Jessel.

Lord EGERTON OF TATTON has been elected Chairman of the Cheshire Quarter Sessions.

Mr. SAMUEL COURTHORPE BOSANQUET, barrister, has been elected Vice-Chairman of the Monmouthshire Quarter Sessions. Mr. Bosanquet is the eldest son of the late Mr. Samuel Richard Bosanquet, barrister, of Dingestow Court, Monmouthshire, and brother of Mr. Frederick Albert Bosanquet, Q.C., and was born in 1831. He was educated at Eton and at Christ Church, Oxford, and he was called to the bar at Lincoln's-inn in Michaelmas Term, 1857.

Sir JOSEPH RUSSELL BAILEY, baronet, M.P., has been elected Chairman of the Brecknockshire Quarter Sessions.

Mr. EDWARD SEPTIMUS COURROUX, solicitor, of 23, Warwick-street, Regent-street, has been appointed Clerk to the Licensing Justices for the Liberty of the Verge of Whitehall and St. James's Palaces. Mr. Courroux was admitted in 1881.

Mr. WILLIAM PERCY MORRISON, solicitor, of Reigate and Redhill, has been elected Coroner for the Croydon Division of Surrey. Mr. Morrison is the son of Mr. George Carter Morrison, solicitor, vestry clerk of Reigate. He was admitted in 1880.

Mr. CHARLES WATKIN RICHARDS, solicitor, of Oswestry, Llangollen, and Corwen, has been appointed Clerk to the Commissioners of Taxes for the Edwinion Division of Merionethshire. Mr. Richards is the son of Mr. Charles Richards, solicitor, clerk to the Commissioners of Lieutenancy for Denbighshire. He was admitted a solicitor in 1874, and he is in partnership with his father and with his brother, Mr. Richard Septimus Richards.

Mr. W. F. KNIGHT, solicitor, of Adelaide-chambers, 52, Gracechurch-street, E.C., and 108, High-street, Deptford, has been appointed a Commissioner to administer Oaths in the Supreme Court.

Mr. WILLIAM WEBB, solicitor (of the firm of Best, Webb, & Templeton), of 6, Essex-street, Strand, has been appointed a Commissioner to administer Oaths in the Supreme Court of Judicature; and Mr. MITCHELL TEMPLETON, M.A. Cantab. (of the same firm), has been appointed a Perpetual Commissioner for taking the Acknowledgments of Deeds by Married Women in the County of Middlesex and the Cities of London and Westminster.

DISSOLUTIONS OF PARTNERSHIPS.

MILTON BRADFORD and FORTESCUE THURSBY (Bradford & Thursby), solicitors, 70, Queen Victoria-street, London. March 25. [*Gazette*, March 30.]

EDWIN GAUNT and JAMES ALFRED GRAINGER (Gaunt & Grainger), solicitors and conveyancers, Manchester. March 24.

JOHN WILLIAM SMITH and JAMES HORATIO MOGGRIDGE (Smith & Moggridge), solicitors, 3, Furnival's-inn, London. Dec. 31. The said James Horatio Moggridge will continue the said business, in his own name, at 4, Furnival's-inn, London. [*Gazette*, April 3.]

LEGISLATION OF THE WEEK.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

March 29.—*Bills Read a Second Time.*

PRIVATE BILLS.—Borrowstounness Town and Harbour; Bristol Port and Channel Dock; Cambrian Railway; Chetham's Patent; East London Railway; Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway; Mullings's Patent; Oxted and Groombridge Railway.

Payment of Wages.

April 2.—*Bill Read a Second Time.*

Army (Annual); National Gallery (Loan).

Bill in Committee.

Municipal Corporations.

April 3.—*Bill in Committee.*

National Gallery (Loan).

April 4.—*Bill Read a Third Time.*

National Gallery (Loan)

COURT PAPERS.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE.

ROTA OF REGISTRARS IN ATTENDANCE ON

Date.	Court of Appeal.	V. C. Bacon.	Mr. Justice Fry.
Monday, April 9	Mr. Clowes	Mr. Lavie	Mr. Teesdale
Tuesday 10	Koe	Carrington	Farrer
Wednesday..... 11	Clowes	Lavie	Teesdale
Thursday 12	Koe	Carrington	Farrer
Friday..... 13	Clowes	Lavie	Teesdale
Saturday..... 14	Koe	Carrington	Farrer
	Mr. Justice Kay.	Mr. Justice Chitty.	Mr. Justice Pearson.
Monday, April 9	Mr. Ward	Mr. Cobby	Mr. King
Tuesday 10	Pemberton	Jackson	Merivale
Wednesday..... 11	Ward	Cobby	King
Thursday 12	Pemberton	Jackson	Merivale
Friday..... 13	Ward	Cobby	King
Saturday..... 14	Pemberton	Jackson	Merivale

EASTER SITTINGS, 1883.

COURT OF APPEAL.

Appeal Court, II.

Final and interlocutory appeals from the Chancery, and Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty Divisions (Probate and Divorce), the London Bankruptcy Court, and the County Palatine and Stannaries Courts.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Tuesday, Apr. 3	App. motns. ex pte—Orgl. motns.—& apps. from orders made on interlocutory mtns, (separate list)
Wednesday 4	Interlocutory appeals cont.
Thur 5	Bkcy apps and also apps from general list if required
Friday 6	Apps. from the general list.
Saturday ... 7	
Monday ... 9	
Tues. 10	
Wednesday 11	App. motns. ex pte.—orgl. mots.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns (separate list), and also apps. from general list, if required.
Thursday.. 12	Bkcy. apps. & also apps. from general list if required
Friday 13	Apps from the general list.
Saturday ..14	
Monday 16	
Tuesday....17.	
Wed. 18	App. mots. ex pte—orgl. mots.—and apps. from orders made on interlocutory mots. (separate list), and also apps. from general list if required.
Thursday ..1	Bkcy. apps. & also apps. from general list if required
Friday 20	Apps. from the general list.
Sat., ...21	
Monday 23	
Tuesday....24	
Wed. 25	App. mots. ex pte.—orgl. mots.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory mots (separate list), & also apps. from general list if required
Thursday.. 26	Bkcy. apps. & also apps. from general list if required
Friday 27	Apps. from the general list.
Saturday ..28	
Monday.....30	
Tuesday,May 1	
Wed 2	App. mots. ex pte—orgl. motns—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory mots (separate list), and also apps. from general list if required.
Thurs 3	Bkcy apps and also apps from general list if required
Friday, ... 4	Apps from the general list.
Saturday .. 5	
Monday 7	
Tues., ... 8	
Wed 9	App. motns. ex pte—orgl. mots—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory mots (separate list), & also apps from general list if required
Thur 10	Bkcy apps & also apps from general list if required
Friday 11	Apps. from the general list.

Appeal Court, I.

Final and interlocutory appeals from the Queen's Bench Division, and from the Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty Division (Admiralty).

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Tuesday, Apr. 3	App. mots. ex pte—orgl. mots—and apps from orders made on interlocutory mots
Wednes 4	Interlocutory apps. contin.
Thursday .. 5	Apps. from the general list.
Friday 6	
Saturday .. 7	
Monday 9	
Tuesday....10	
Wednday ..11	App. mots. ex pte—orgl. mots.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory mots and also apps from general list if required.
Thursdy ..12	Apps from the general list.
Friday, ...13	
Saturday ..14	
Monday, ..16	
Tuesday .. 17	
Wednesday 18	App. mots. ex pte—orgl. mots—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory mots and also apps from general list if required.
Thursday ...19	Apps. from the general list.
Friday.....20	
Saturday ..21	
Monday....23	
Tuesday....24	
Wednesday, 25	App. motns. ex pte—orgl. mots.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory mots and also app . from general list if required.
Thursday ..26	Apps. from the general list.
Friday 27	
Saturday ..28	
Monday....30	
Tuesday,May 1	
Wednesday 2	App motns ex pte—orgal. motns—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory mots and also apps. from general list if required.
Thursday .. 3	Apps. from the general list.
Friday 4	
Saturday .. 5	
Monday 7	
Tuesday.... 8	
Wednesday 9	App. motns. ex pte—orgal. mots.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory mots and also apps. from general list if required.
Thursday ..10	Apps. from the general list.
Friday, .. 11	

Further considerations will be taken as part of the general paper in priority to original causes which have not already appeared in the paper.

Any cause intended to be heard as a short cause, must be so marked in the cause book at least one clear day before the same can be put in the paper to be so heard, and the necessary papers must be left in court with the judge's officer the day before the cause is to be put into the paper.

Chancery Court, II.

MR. JUSTICE FRY.

Tuesday, Apr. 3	Sitting with the Rule Com.
Wednesday.. 4	
Thursday .. 5	Motions and adj. sums.
Friday 6	Sht. caus, pets. adj. sumns., & gen pa.
Saturday .. 7	Adj. sums. & gen. pa.
Monday 9	General paper.
Tuesday....10	
Wednesday 11	
Thursday.. 12	Motns. adj. sum. & gen. pa.
Friday.....13	Sht. caus., ptns. adj.sumns. and gen. pa.
Saturday ..14	Adj. sums & gen. pa.
Monday 16	General paper.
Tuesday....17	
Wednesday 18	
Thursday ..19	Motns. adj. sum. & gen. pa
Friday 20	Sht. caus, pets. adj. sumns. & gen. pa.
Sat. 21	Adj. sums. & gen. pa.
Monday 23	General paper.
Tuesday....24	
Wednesday 25	
Thursday .. 26	Motns. adj. sum. & gen. pa.
Friday 27	Sht. caus, pets. adj. sumns. & gen. pa.
Saturday ..28	Adj. sums. & gen. pa.
Monday 30	General paper.
Tuesday,May 1	
Wednesday 2	
Thursday .. 3	Mots. adj. sumns & gen. pa.
Friday 4	Sht. caus, pets., adj. sumns., & gen. pa.
Saturday .. 5	Adj. sums. & gen. pa.
Mond 7	
Tues. 8	General paper.
Wed, ... 9	
Thursday ..10	Motns. adj. sums. & gen.pa.
Friday 11	Sht. caus., ptns, adj. sums. & gen pa.

Causes in which witnesses are to be examined before the court, will be taken on Mondays, Tuesdays, and Wednesdays; and causes without witnesses, and further considerations will be taken on Thursdays, Fridays, and Saturdays.

Any cause intended to be heard as a short cause must be so marked in the cause book at least one clear day before the same can be put in the paper to be so heard, and the necessary papers must be left in court with the judge's officer the day before the cause is to be put into the paper.

Chancery Court, IV.

MR. JUSTICE KAY.

During the absence of Mr. Justice Kay on the Spring Circuit the business of his lordship's court will be continued by Mr. Justice Pearson.

Tuesday, Apr. 3	Mots. & gen. pa.
Wednesday 4	General paper
Thursd 5	
Friday 6	Pets., adj sums, & gen. pa.
Saturdy 7	Sht. caus. & adj sums.
Monday 9	General paper.
Tues. 10	
Wednesday..11	
Thursday ..12	Motns. & gen. pa.
Friday 13	Pets., adj sums., & gen. pa.
Saturdy, ...14	Sht. caus., & adj. sums.
Monday....16	General paper
Tuesday....17	
Wednesday 18	
Thursday ..19	Mots. & gen. pa.
Friday 20	Pets., adj sums., & gen. pa.
Saturday ..21	Sht. caus., & adj sums.
Monday....23	General paper.
Tuesday....24	
Wednesday 25	
Thursday ..26	Mtns. & gen. pa.
Friday 27	Petns, adj sums, & gen. pa.
Saturday ..28	Short caus., & ad. sums.
Monday....30	General paper.
Tuesday,May 1	
Wednes, .. 2	
Thurs. 3	Mots. & gen. pa.
Friday 4	Petns, adj sums, & gen. pa.
Saturdy, ... 5	Sht. caus., & adj. sums.
Monday.... 7	General paper.
Tuesday.... 8	
Wednesday..9	
Thursday ..10	Motns. & gen. pa.
Friday 11	Pets. sht. causes, adj sums & gen. pa.

Causes in which witnesses are to be examined will be taken on Tuesdays and Wednesdays; and causes without witnesses will be taken on Mondays, Thursdays, and Fridays; further considerations will be taken on Mondays.

Any cause intended to be heard as a short cause must be so marked in the cause book at least one clear day before the same can be put in the paper to be so heard, and the necessary papers must be left in court with the judge's officer the day before the cause is to be put into the paper.

Chancery Court, III.

MR. JUSTICE CHITTY.

Tuesday, Apr. 3	Motions.
Wed. 4	Non witness causes.
Thursday .. 5	
Friday 6	Motions continued.
Saturdy,.... 7	Pets., sht. caus., adj. sums. (Procedure), & gen. pa.
Monday 9	Fur. cons., dems. & non wit causes
Tuesday....10	Non witness causes.
Wednesday..11	Causes with wits
Thursday ..12	
Friday 13	Motns. & gen pa.
Satd ay 14	Pets, sht. caus, adj. sums. (Procedure), and gen. pa.
Monday 16	Fur cons., dems., & non-wit causes
Tuesday....17	General paper.
Wednesdy ..18	
Thursday ..19	
Friday 20	Motns. & gen. pa.
Saturday ..21	Pets, sht. caus, adj., sums. (Procedure), and gen. pa.
Monday 23	Fur. cons., dems. & non wit causes
Tuesday....24	General paper
Wednesday..25	
Thursd 26	
Friday 27	Mots. & gen. pa.
Sat., ...28	Pets., sht. caus., adj. sums, (Procedure) and gen. pa.
Monday....30	Fur. cons., dems., & non wit causes
Tuesday,May 1	General paper.
Wednes. 2	
Thursd 3	
Friday, ... 4	Motns. & gen. pa.
Saturday .. 5	Pets.,sht. causes,adj. sums. (procedure), and gen. pa.
Monday.... 7	Fur. cons., dems., & non wit causes
Tuesday .. 8	General paper
Wednesday 9	
Thursday ..10	
Friday 11	Mtns. & gen. pa.

Causes and actions in which witnesses are to be examined before the court will, for the present, be taken on Wednesdays and Thursdays, and causes and actions without witnesses will be taken on Mondays and Tuesdays; but when the

list of causes and actions without witnesses is reduced, causes and actions with witnesses will be taken on Tuesdays also.

Any cause intended to be heard as a short cause must be so marked in the cause-book at least one clear day before the same can be put in the paper to be so heard, and the necessary papers must be left in court with the judge's officer the day before the cause is to be put in the paper.

Lord Chancellor's Court.

Mr. Justice PEARSON.

SPECIAL NOTICE.—During the absence of Mr. Justice Kay on the Spring Circuit, Baron Pollock will sit in Queen's Bench Court, I., and take the actions in the Chancery Division assigned for trial on Mr. Justice Pearson.

Tuesday,..pr.3 } General paper.
Wedsdy..... 4
Thursday .. 5
Friday, ... 6
Saturday .. 7

Monday .... 9 } General paper.
Tuesday....10
Wednesday .11
Thurs. 12
Friday 13
Saturday ..14

Monday ....16 } General paper.
Tuesday ..17
Wednesday .18
Thursday ..19
Friday 20
Saturday ..21

Monday ....23 } General paper.
Tuesday .. .24
Wed., ...25
Thursday ..26
Friday 27
Saturday ..28

Monday.....30 } General paper.
Tuesday,May1
Wednsday.. 2
Thursday ... 3
Friday 4
Sat., ... 5

Monday .... 7 } General paper
Tuesday.... 8
Wednesday . 9
Thursday ..10
Friday 11

COURT OF APPEAL.

EASTER SITTINGS, 1883.

LIST OF APPEALS FOR HEARING.

(Set down to Thursday, 29th March, inclusive.)

APPEALS FROM THE CHANCERY DIVISION AND THE PROBATE, DIVORCE, AND ADMIRALTY DIVISION (PROBATE AND DIVORCE), AND THE COUNTY PALATINE AND STANNARIES COURTS.

GENERAL LIST.

1881.

Samuel v Samuel app of plt from Master of Rolls June 7

1882.

In re The Potteries, Shrewsbury and North Wales Ry Co, and a fund in court standing to the credit of the said Co app of L H Elkington and ors from Mr Justice Kay Feb 25

Perry v The International Ocean Telegraph Co and ors app of plts from V C Bacon June 1

Parkin v Chesterfield Union app of plt V C H Sept 27

Morecroft v Evans app of plt from V C of County Palatine of Lancaster Oct 20 Security ordered, Dec 15

Taylor v Mostyn app of defts Lady Mostyn & ors from V C B Aug 5 Mostyn v Lancaster app of defts from V C B Oct 26

In re The Scottish Petroleum Co limd and Co's Acts app of Richard Black and ors Kay, J Oct 31

Hodgson v Mawer app of deft North, J Nov 11

Harrison v Lentner app of plt V C B Nov 17 (Security ordered Jan 31)

Kaltentack and Co v Lewis and anr app of plt V C B Nov 28

In re Edward Williams, decd Williams v Williams app of deft Gertrude L Williams V C B Nov 30

Pearson v Seligman app of plt Chitty, J Nov 30

Essex v Appleton app of deft Pearson, J Dec 1

Dunball v Broad Street Station Dwellings and Workshops Co limd app of plt Pearson, J Dec 6

In re Contract between James Bellamy and anr and the Metropolitan Board of Works and V and P Act app of Met Board of Works Kay, J Dec 9

In re the Cwm Ricket and Maesnant Lead Mining Company and Co's Acts app of exors of Joshua Moss Chitty, J Dec 9

In re Contract for Sale of Real and Leasehold Estates dated 15th March, 1882, between Eliza M A Marsh and Earl Granville and V and P Act app of Eliza M A Marsh from Mr Justice Fry Dec 11

King v Lucas app of deft from Mr Justice Kay Dec 15

In re Trade Mark numbered 8,057, registered by James B Palmer, and Trade Marks Registration Act, 1875 app of W Bryant and anr from Mr Justice Chitty Dec 16

In re The Army and Navy Provision Market, &c., limd and Co's Acts app of Army and Navy Provision Market limd from Mr Justice Fry Dec 22

In re The Haven Gold Mining Co, limd, and Co's Acts app of official liquidator from V C Bacon Dec 22

Pittar v The Lake Valley of Switzerland Ry Co app of defts from Mr Justice Chitty Dec 23

In re The Blackburn and District Benefit Building Society and Co's Acts app of Mary Walton from V C of County Palatine of Lancaster Dec 29

In re Fairman, decd, and 10 & 11 Vict. c. 96 app of E Bird and ors from Kay, J Dec 30

1883.

In re The Columbia Chemical Factory Manure, &c, Co, limd, and Co's Acts (ex parte R Hewet) app of Liquidator from Kay, J Jan 2

In re Warren's Settlement and Conveyancing, &c, Act, 1881 app of Emma J Warren from Fry, J Jan 2

Birkinshaw v Tail app of Mary Balinforth from Chitty, J Jan 3

Frazi v Dando app of plt from Kay, J Jan 3

In re The Columbia Chemical Factory, Manure, &c, Co, limd, and Co's Acts app of liquidator from Kay, J Jan 5

Butcher v Pooler app of defts from V C B Jan 5

Rollings v London Scottish Permanent Benefit Building Society app of plt from Kay, J Jan 5

In re T P Williams, decd Earl of Eglinton v Williams app of deft from Chitty, J Jan 8

In re The British Guardian Life Assurance Corporation and Co's Acts app of Sir Edwin Pearson from Kay, J Jan 9

Greer v Young app of H H Fanshawe and anr from Jan 12

Wiles v Pickering app of deft from Pearson, J Jan 13

Drew v The Metropolitan Board of Works app of defts from Mr. Justice Pearson Jan 16

In re Francis Randolph, decd, and 10 & 11 Vict. c. 96 app of Francis Randolph and ors from V C Bacon Jan 18

Russell v Watts app of defts other than Nathaniel Duckworth from V C Bacon Russell v Watts app of Nathaniel Duckworth from V C Bacon Jan 20

In re Will Trusts of Samuel Hone Showers, decd, and 10 & 11 Vict c 96 app of pstnrs from Mr Justice Fry Jan 26

Liebig's Extract of Meat Co, limd v George Hooper & Co app of plts from Mr Justice Field for Mr Justice Kay Jan 27

Liebig's Extract of Meat Co, limd v Anderson app of plts from Mr Justice Field from Mr Justice Kay Jan 27

Cooper v Metropolitan Board of Works app of defts from V C B Jan 27

Maynard v Marks and ors app of plt from V C B Jan 29

In re The Taurine Co, limd, & Co's Acts app of official liquidator from V C B Jan 30

Maynard v Marks and ors app of deft E T Gourley from V C B Jan 30

Moore v Bennett app of deft from Mr Justice Field, from Mr Justice Kay Jan 31

Caledonian Ry Co v Solway Junction Ry Co app of defts from Mr Justice Kay Feb 2

Carter v White and anr app of plt from Mr Justice Kay Feb 6 (abated by death of deft Sir T White)

Goldsmid v Gt Eastern Ry Co app of defts from V C B Feb 6

Mackintosh v Chalmers app of plts from V C B Feb 8

Corbett v Plowden app of plts from Baron Pollock for Mr Justice Pearson Feb 10

In re T Boddington, decd Boddington v Clairat app of plt from Mr Justice Fry Feb 12

Penfold v Stromeyer app of deft from V C B Feb 13

Kettlewell v Watson app of plts from Mr Justice Fry Feb 14

Edleston v Jones app of defts from V C of County Palatine of Lancaster Feb 14

Biggs v Mason app of plt from Mr Justice Fry Feb 14

In re John Brier, decd Brier v Evison app of defts from Mr Justice Chitty Feb 16

In re The Milan Tramways Co ld & Co's Acts app of official liquidator from Mr Justice Kay Feb 19

In re The Quartz Hill Consolidated Gold Mining Co ld & Co's Acts app of Alfred Tucker from V C B Feb 21

Robinson v Archibald app of deft from Mr Justice Fry Feb 22

Stott v Milne app of plt from V C of County Palatine of Lancaster Feb 23

The Northern Counties of England Fire Insurance Co ld v Whipp app of plt co from V C of County Palatine of Lancaster Feb 23 (Security ordered March 6)

In re The Met Brush Electric Light and Power Co ld & Co's Acts app of B Ollendorff from Mr Justice Chitty Feb 26

Warren v Le Marchant app of plt from Mr Justice Kay Feb 27

Knell v Walker app of plt from Baron Pollock for Mr Justice Pearson March 1

Hart v Hobbs app of plt from Baron Pollock from Mr Justice Pearson March 2

Squire v Hutchings app of defts from V C B March 2

In re J H Cameron, decd Nixon v Cameron app of Louisa Cameron from V C of County Palatine of Lancaster March 2

Gill v Woodfin app of deft from V C B March 3

France v Clarke app of deft W G Quihampton from Mr Justice Fry Mar 5

In re The Quartz Hill Consolidated Gold Mining Co ld and Co's Acts (Young's case) app of R Young from Mr Justice Pearson Mar 5

The Auvergne Bituminous Rock and Paving Co ld v Churchward app of defts Foster and anr from Mr Justice Fry Mar 5

Mullins v Miller app of plts from V C Bacon Mar 6

Widdop v Pearson app of plt from Mr Justice Kay Mar 6

In re The Mynydd Gordon Lead Mine ld and Co's Acts app of G D White from V C Bacon Mar 7

In re The International Financial Society ld and reduced and Co's Acts app of P F F Strousberg from Mr Justice Fry Mar 7 (Security ordered Mar 13)

In re The Phœnix Chemical Works ld and Co's Acts app of C T Gilbert from Mr Justice Chitty Mar 7

In re The Photographic Co-Operative Supply Association ld and Co's Acts app of the Co from Mr Justice Chitty Mar 8

In re The Sumburgh Mining Co ld and Co's Acts app of Wm Oliver from Mr Justice Chitty Mar 10

Holyland v Lewin app of deft from Mr Justice Chitty Mar 13

In re Sanderson, decd Wright v Sanderson app of plt from so much of decree of Sir James Hannen as pronounces for probate of codicil Mar 13

Strickland v Symonds app of plt from Mr Justice Pearson Mar 14

Swift v Pannell app of defts from Mr Justice Fry Mar 20

Woodhouse v Hargreaves app of deft from V C Bacon Mar 21

Gibbings v Strong app of deft Burbidge from Mr Justice Fry Mar 21

Bloxam and anr v Favre and ors app of plts from judgt of Sir James Hannen overruling demr to defence and pronouncing against validity of paper writing Mar 28

In re Thomas Harrald, decd Wilde v Walford app of plts from Mr Justice Fry Mar 28

McWean v McNaughtan app of plt from V C of County Palatine of Lancaster Mar 28

From Orders made on Interlocutory Motions in the Chancery and Probate and

Divorce Divisions.

1882.

Danvillier v Myers app of plt from Chitty, J Aug 4

Harvey v Abbott app of deft C J Abbott from V C B Aug 11

Dreyfus & Co v The Peruvian Guano Co, limd app of The Peruvian Guano Co, limd, from order of V C B dated Jan 19 The Peruvian Guano Co, limd v Bockwoldt app of plt Co from order of V C B dated Jan 19 Jan 20

Cosgrove v Maddison app of deft from V C B (abated by death of plt) Feb 8

Kennedy v Lyell app of deft from V C B Feb 12

The Berliner Brauuer Gesellschaft Tivoli v Knights, Stocks, & Co, limd app of defts from Chitty, J Feb 20

Copeland v The Chatterley Iron Co, limd app of defts from Fry, J Feb 20

Games v Bonnor app of deft from Pearson J Feb 26

In re Wm. Raper, decd, and in re The Met. Street Improvements Acts and Lands Clauses Act, 1845 app of C H Reynell from Chitty, J. Feb 26

Westinghouse v The Midland Ry Co app of defts from V C Bacon Feb 29

In re Adam Norris & 22, 23 Vict c 35 Allen v Norris app of plt from Mr Justice Fry Feb 28 (heard Mar 20 by Lords Justices Cotton and Lindley—judgt given 21-Mar—S O by order)
Corrie v Allen app of deft Robert Allen from Mr Justice Pearson Corrie v Allen app of deft George J Allen from Mr Justice Pearson Mar 1
Balfour v Cooper app of defts from Mr Justice Pearson Mar 2
In re John Brown, decd Ward v Morse app of deft S Morse from Mr Justice Chitty Mar 2
Barber v Mackrell app of W R Soicer from order of Mr Justice Fry dated Feb 17 Barber v Mackrell app of deft from order of Mr Justice Fry dated Feb 17 Mar 12
Le Nouveau Monde v Pelazzi app of plts from Mr Justice Fry Mar 13
In re Courtenay Mansel, decd Rhodes v Jenkins app of deft Charles Norton from Mr Justice Fry Mar 13
Phillips v Homfray app of deft Mary Fothergill from Mr Justice Pearson Phillips v Homfray app of plt from Mr Justice Pearson Mar 14
Mons v Baron Tweedmouth app of plt from Mr Justice Fry Mar 15
In re A F Slade, decd Slade v Hulme app of Sydney Slade and ors from Mr Justice Fry Mar 15
Dreyfus Bros and Co v The Peruvian Guano Co ld app of defts from order of V C Bacon dated Mar 13 The Peruvian Guano Co ld v Bockwoldt app of plts from order of V C Bacon dated Mar 13 Mar 16
In re Daniel Callaghan, decd Elliott v Lambert app of plts from Mr Justice Pearson Mar 16
Wharton v Boffin app of plt from Mr Justice Fry Mar 19
Liardet v Hammon Electric Light and Power Supply Co, Lmd app of defts from Mr Justice Chitty March 21
In re Norwich Provident Assurance Society app of L C Alexander from V C Bacon March 22
Graves v MacMurdo app of deft from Mr Justice Fry March 22
Hotham v Tucker app of deft J A Jung from V C Bacon March 28

FROM THE QUEEN'S BENCH AND PROBATE, DIVORCE, AND ADMIRALTY (ADMIRALTY) DIVISIONS.

For Judgment.

Brolk A Heaven v J D Pender, trading as West India Graving Dock Co (Q B Crown Side) app of plt from Justices Field and Cave on app from county court (c a v March 5—present Lords Justices Brett, Cotton, and Bowen)

1882.

For hearing.

Cowchman v Greener app of plt from judgt of Baron Pollock at trial Feb 11 (day for hearing to be fixed, by order of July 6)
Pearse and ors v McDonald and anr app of deft McDonald from judgt of Mr Justice Bowen at trial June 5 Pearse and ors v McDonald and anr app of deft McDonald from order of Justices Grove and Mathew for new trial June 22
Pearse and ors v McDonald and anr app of deft Mockford from judgt of Mr Justice Bowen at trial June 5 Pearse and ors v McDonald and anr app of deft Mockford from order of Justices Grove and Mathew for new trial June 22 (c a v M Dec 12—present the Lord Chief Justice and Lords Justices Baggallay and Lindley—S O with liberty to apply)
The Alexandria Water Co, ld v Musgrave, Surveyor of Taxes (Q B Revenue side) app of Alexandria Water Co, ld, from judgt of Justices Grove and North as case stated by Commrs of Income Tax June 16 (s o till mentioned by order of Dec 18)
Pyne v City Offices Co app of defts from Sir Thomas Chambers (Judge of Mayor's Court) giving judgt for plt on motn for new trial after verdict for deft July 7 (Part heard March 13 by Lords Justices Brett, Cotton, and Bowen)
London and Provincial Bank, ld v Jones app of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Williams on f c after trial July 20
Sanders Bros v Maclean, Maris & Co app of plt from judgt of Baron Pollock at trial in London July 21
Capell v Gt Western Ry Co app of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Lopes on f c after trial July 22
Barker and anr v Beckett and ors, exors app of plts from judgt of Mr Justice Manisty at trial July 25
Ormerod and ors v Todmorden Joint Stock Mill Co, limd app of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Cave at trial July 26
Pulbrook v Melhado and anr app of defts from refusal of the Lord Chief Justice and Mr Justice Stephen to send back to referee Pulbrook v Melhado and anr app of defts from judgt of the Lord Chief Justice and Mr Justice Stephen on referee's report July 26
Dewes v Lady A. Piers app of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Stephen at trial July 26
Ship Renpor The Owners of the Mary Louisa and her Master and Crew v The Owners of the Renpor and the Master thereof app of plts from judgt of Sir R. J. Phillimore (without assessors) Aug 5
Clements v Mathews app of deft from judgt of Mr. Justice Lopes on f c after trial Aug 7
Lewis v Bowen and anr app of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Manisty at trial Aug 8
Wood v Arrowsmith & anr app of plt from judgt of Lord Justice Bowen at trial Aug 9
Longton, Mills, and Co v Armishaw and anr app of plts from judgt of Lord Justice Bowen at trial Aug 9
Baroness Wenlock and ors v River Dee Co app of defts from judgt of Baron Huddleston at trial Aug 9
Hickman v Robinson and ors app of plt from judgt of Mr Justice Field on f c after trial Robinson and ors v Hickman app of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Field on f c after trial Aug 10
Wall v Taylor app of deft from Justices Mathew and Cave directing entry of judgt for plt Aug 15
Salberg, Bros & Co v Moore app of plts from the L C J and L J Brett (sitting as a Divisional Court) setting aside verdict obtained in Shoreditch County Court Aug 18
Shaw v Benson and anr Exors, &c app of plt from judgt of Mr Justice Mathew at trial at Leeds Aug 19
Bacon v Hayton and anr app of plt from judgt of Mr Justice Day at trial at Liverpool Aug 29
Thomas v The Amlurh Mutual Marine Insurance Co app of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Day at trial at Liverpool Sept 1
The Queen v Bridgnorth Poor Law Guardians (Q B Crown Side) app of defts from Justices Field and Cave affirming order of sessions Sept 20
Wall v Martin app of dft from Justices Field and Cave setting aside verdict and giving judgt for plt Oct 19
Ship Elin Owners of the Paria v Owners of the Elin and freight app of crew of the Elin (interveners) from judgt of Sir R J Phillimore on sp case (without Assessors) Oct 28
Herts v MacGregor, trading, &c app of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Lopes at trial at Bristol Oct 30
Parkinson v The Junction Iron Works Co ld app of plt from judgt of Mr Justice Day at trial at Liverpool Nov 1
Gray v Strait and anr app of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Lopes at trial in Middlesex Nov 6
The Great Western Ry Co v Lewis and ors app of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Manisty at trial at Swansea Nov 13
Sheffield and anr v Dawson and ors Sheffield and anr v Dawson and ors and H S Leonard 3rd party (consolidated acts) app of deft Handelaar from judgt of Justices Denman and Manisty setting aside verdict and directing judgt for plt actn tried by Mr Justice Day Nov 14
Cassaboglou v Gibb, Livingston & Co app of plt from judgt of Justices Manisty and Williams on sp c Nov 16
Garrard and anr v Lewis app of defts from judgt of Lord Justice Bowen after trial at Bristol Nov 16
Cooper and anr v Pritchard app of deft from judgt of Baron Pollock at trial at Westminster Nov 21
Coverdale, Todd and Co v Grant and Co app of plt from judgt of Baron Pollock after trial Nov 28
Ravcraft v Low, Huckvale and Co, and ors app of plt from judgt of Baron Pollock at trial at Westminster Dec 5 (Security for £20 ordered Dec 20)
Lion Mutual Marine Insurance Assen v Tucker app of plts from judgt of Justices Field and Williams on sp c Dec 5
White v Willoughby and ors app of plt from judgt of Baron Pollock at trial at Westminster Dec 7
Crossley and Sons, limd v Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the Borough of Halifax app of defts from judgt of Lord Justice Bowen after trial Dec 8
Woodley and Co v Mitchell and Co app of plts from judgt of Mr. Justice Hawkins after trial Dec 8
Gilbey, extrix &c. v Jeffries Cavill. exor &c. v Jeffries app of pltff from judgt of Mr. Justice Field on demr Dec 8
Williams v The Pontypool Gas and Water Co app of plt from judgt of Mr. Justice Hawkins at trial in Middlesex Dec 9
Gorton v Macintosh app of plt from judgt of Justices Denman and North setting aside verdict and giving judgt for deft act tried by Mr. Justice Day at Liverpool Assizes Dec 12
Taylor and ors v Hailstone app of plts from judgt of Mr. Justice Mathew after trial at Leeds Summer Assizes Dec 13
Pearsall v The Brierley Hill Local Board app of plt from judgt of Lord Justice Bowen after trial at Gloucester Dec 21
Starr v Hall 1881—S—5,723 app of plt from judgt of Justices Denman and Manisty setting aside verdict and judgt Dec 23 Starr v Hall 1882—S—303 app of plt from order of Justices Denman and Manisty for new trial—act tried by Mr Justice Lopes with a special jury Dec 23
Howard v The Union Bank of Birmingham app of plt from Justices Denman, Manisty and North setting aside verdict for plt and directing judgt for deft—act tried by Mr Justice Fry at Warwick Dec 27
Coventry, Sheppard & Co v Great Eastern Ry Co app of defts from judgt of Baron Pollock at trial without a jury at Guildhall Dec 29

1882.

Midland Ry Co v Wilmington District Local Board app of plts from judgt of Mr Justice North after trial at Manchester Dec 30

1883.

Voss and Co v East and West India Docks Co app of plts from judgt of Baron Pollock at trial in London Jan 2
Kearsley v Philips and ors app of plt from judgt of Mr Justice Field on demr Jan 8
The Municipal Permanent Investment Benefit Society v Edwards and anr app of plt from so much of judgt of Mr Justice Lopes at trial as relates to deft Kent Jan 8 The Municipal Permanent Investment Building Society v Edwards and anr app of deft Edwards from so much of judgt of Mr Justice Lopes at trial as relates to deft Edwards Jan 12
The Cumberland Co-operative Building Society v The Furness Ry Co app of defts from judgt of Justices Field and Williams on special case Jan 9
Milnes v Mayor, Aldermen and Burgesses of the Borough of Huddersfield app of plt from judgt of Mr Justice Mathew on fur con after trial at Leeds Jan 12
Hope v Russel and ors app of plt from Justices Denman and North affirming dismissal before pleading of vexatious action with costs Jan 17
The Municipal Elections Acts, 1872 and 1875 Henry and ors, petnrs v Armitage, respt app of petnrs from order of Justices Field and Williams dismissing petn to declare election for Town Council void Jan 20
Castle v The Ramsgate Improvement Commissioners app of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Denman and Baron Pollock on special case agreed upon at trial Jan 23
Murray, Trustee, &c, v Waring and ors, Trading, &c app of plts from judgt of Mr Justice Grove at trial in Middlesex Jan 25
Millford and ors v Clode app of deft from judgt of Lord Justice Baggallay at trial at Exeter Jan 30
Parker v The First Avenue Hotel Co, limd. app of plt from judgt of Mr Justice North at trial in Middlesex Feb 1
Steam Tug "The United Service" Isaac Leggett Cole v The Great Yarmouth Steam Tug Co, limd, Owners of "The United Service" app of plt from judgt of Sir R J Phillimore Feb 1 (without Assessors)
Oxford Guardians v Evans and anr (Representatives of the Colleges) app of defts from order of Justices Field and Williams for mandamus on special case directing levy of rate on Colleges for Election Petition Costs Feb 2
May v Jacobs app of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Mathew at trial at Lewes Feb 5
Peckett and anr v Osbourne, Graham, & Co app of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Day at trial at Durham with special jury Feb 7
Barlow v Accrington Victoria Permanent Building Society app of plt from judgt of Mr Justice Kay at trial at Manchester Feb 15
Knights, Stocks, & Co, limd, and anr (trading, &c) v Tennick app of plts from judgt of Mr Justice Day at trial at Durham Feb 15

Stock v Inglis app from judgt of Mr Justice Field at trial at Westminster with special jury Feb 27
Matthewman v Turner app of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Day at trial at Leeds March 1
In re Benjamin Hope, a Solicitor app of Charles Clode from judgt of Justices Manisty and Mathew March 8
Ocean Steam Ship Co v Anderson, Tritton, & Co app of plts from Justices Grove, Lopes, and Mathew setting aside judgt at trial and giving judgt to deft —Action tried by Mr Justice Cave in London March 13
Drake & Co v Jardin & Co app of defts from Justices Lopes and Mathew setting aside non-suit at trial and directing judgt for plt on claim and counter-claim March 14
The Silver Hill Mining Co v Bridge app of plts from judgt of Mr Justice Grove on claim and counter-claim at trial at Bristol March 14
The Queen v The Churchwardens of St Matthew, Bethnal Green, Middlesex app of the Vestry of St Matthew from order of Baron Pollock and Baron Huddleston for peremptory mandamus March 17
Stott v Fairlamb and ors (trustees of Fairlamb's Estate) app of plt from judgt of Mr Justice Denman on fur con after trial at Leeds March 19
Burdick and ors v Sewell app of plt from judgt of Mr Justice Field on fur con after trial in London March 20
Hillier and ors, trustees v Howell & Co app of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Denman at trial March 22
Trower, Clk v Peek, Bart app of plt from judgt of Mr Justice Lopes at trial March 28

FROM PROBATE, DIVORCE, AND ADMIRALTY DIVISION.

(Probate and Divorce.)

For Hearing.

In Appeal Court II.

In re Sanderson, decd Wright v Sanderson app of plts from so much of decree of Sir James Hannen as pronounces for probate of codicil Mar 13
Bloxam and anr v Favre and ors app of plts from judgt of Sir James Hannen overruling demr to defence and pronouncing against validity of paper writing Mar 28

(Admiralty).

For Hearing.

Without Nautical Assessors in Appeal Court I.

Ship Renpor Owners of the Mary Louisa and ors v Owners of the Renpor and ors app of plts from judgt of Sir R J Phillimore Aug 5
Ship Elin Owners of the Paria v Owners of the Elin app of Crew of the Elin from judgt of Sir R J Phillimore Oct 28
Ship Leon XIII. Wardrop and ors v Owners of Ship Leon XIII app of plts from interlocutory order of Sir R J Phillimore Dec 1
Steam Tug United Service J L Cole v Great Yarmouth Steam Tug Co ld app of plt from judgt of Sir R J Phillimore Feb 1

For Hearing.

With Nautical Assessors in Appeal Court I.

1882.

Ship Rigsborg Minde Hodson, Clerk of Trustees of Aire and Calder Navgn v Owners of the Rigsborg Minde app of defts from judgt of Sir R J Phillimore July 7
Ship Gemma Gen Steam Navgn Co and ors v Owners of Gemma app of deft from judgt of Sir R J Phillimore July 28
Ship Carmona Dixon and anr v Owners of Carmona app of defts from judgt of Sir R J Phillimore July 28
Ship Virgo Reading, Palmer and ors v Owners of the Virgo and Freight app of defts from judgt of Sir R J Phillimore Aug 1

1883.

Ship Peruvian (Liverpool District Registry) Owners of Steamship Clan Maclean v Owners of Steamship Peruvian app of plt from judgt of Sir R J Phillimore Feb 9
Ship Mammoth The Royal Exchange Shipping Co, ld v The East and West India Dock Co app of defts from judgt of Sir R J Phillimore March 5
Ship Malwa Cayzer, Irvine & Co, Owners of Clan Forbes v The Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Co, Owners of the Malwa app of plts from judgt of Sir R J Phillimore March 5
Ship Northern Star Geo Butchard and ors, Owners, Master and Crew of Steam Tug Wellington v Owners of the Barque Northern Star her cargo and freight app of plts from judgt of Sir R J Phillimore March 7
Ship Alne Holme Owners of Medea and ors v Owners of Alne Holme app of defts from judgt of Sir R J Phillimore March 13
Ship Alne Holme Owners of Cargo of the Medea v Owners of Alne Holme app of defts from judgt of Sir R J Phillimore March 13
Ship Lancaster Glover Bros and ors v Owners of the Lancaster, cargo and freight app of defts from judgt of Sir R J Phillimore March 21

N.B —The Admiralty appeals with assessors will be taken on special days to be appointed by the court. The non-assessor cases are placed in the list for hearing in the order of date of setting down. The Probate and Divorce Appeals will be taken with the Chancery Appeals in Appeal Court II.

From Orders made on Interlocutory Motions in the Queen's Bench and Admiralty Divisions.

1882.

The Queen on the Prosecution of R M Kerr, Esq, Judge of City of London Court v Benjamin Scott, Esq (Chamberlain) and Treasurer of City of London Court app of R M Kerr, Esq from Justices Field and Cave refusing mandamus July 3
Ship Leon XIII (Liverpool District Registry) Wardrop and ors v Owners of Ship Leon XIII app of plts from interlocutory order of Sir R J Phillimore Dec 1 (restored by order)
Watkin v Reeves app of deft from order of Justices Field and Stephen allowing plts' objection to taxation Dec 12 (pt hd March 15th, by Lords Justices Brett, Cotton and Bowen)
Perkins v Beresford app of defts from order of Justices Field and Stephen giving plt costs of action Dec 19
Tarling v Cooper and ors app of defts from Justices Denman, Manisty, and North, discharging rule nisi for new trial—action tried by Mr Justice Stephen Dec 21
The Normanton Gas Co v Pope and Pearson, ld app of defts from judgt of Justices Field and Williams on special case stated in action Dec 23

1883.

Popham v Gunn and anr app of defts from Justices Denman and North discharging rule nisi for new trial—action tried by Mr Justice Mathew at Westminster Jan 1
Capital Fire Insurance Association, ld v Dawman app of plt from Justices Hawkins and Stephen confirming order of Mr Justice Day giving deft unconditional leave to defend Jan 1
ervis v Debenham and anr app of plt from Justices Denman, Manisty and North, discharging rule nisi for new trial—action tried by Mr. Justice Williams at Gloucester Jan 2
Pountney v Clayton app of deft from rule nisi discharged by Mr Justice Denman—Mr Justice Manisty dissenting—action tried by Mr Justice Williams at Shrewsbury Jan 6
McGowan and anr v Middleton app of deft from refusal of Mr Justice Hawkins to order judgt to be signed for deft on counter-claim—Mr Justice Stephen dissenting Jan 9
The Queen on Prosecution of H M Treasury v Justices of Peace for County of Middlesex (Q B Crown Side) app of defts from order of Justices Field and Stephen for mandamus to pay pension money Jan 10
In re an Action commenced in Lord Mayor's Court Kayser v Parker app of deft from Justices Hawkins and Stephens dismissing applcn for prohbn Jan 10
Lawson v Wallasey Local Board app of defts from order of Justices Denman and Manisty on special case stated in action Jan 10
Howard v Maitland app of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Day without a jury subject to reference as to damages Jan 12
Rooney, the younger v Whiteley app of defts from order of Justices Field and Stephen for conditional liberty to inspect account books Feb 7
Lees v Amey and ors Lees v Free Bridges v Free (James, 3rd party) app of defts from order of Justices Manisty and Stephen for final judgt on referee's report Feb 8
Abouloff v Oppenheimer app of defts from Justices Manisty and Stephen refusing order for rejoinder of plt's husband as co-plt Feb 14 (security ordered)
Turner and anr v Marriott and anr app of plts from Baron Pollock and Mr Justice Manisty refusing to make Marriott's executors defts Feb 14
Mason & Co v Stuart app of plts from Baron Pollock and Mr Justice Manisty reinstating counter-claim and staying execution without leave of Judge Feb 15
Municipal Permanent Benefit Building Society v Kent app of plts from order of Justices Manisty and Stephen Feb 16
The Quartz Hill Consolidated Gold Mining Co, ld v Eyre argument of rule nisi for new trial granted by Court of Appeal Feb 19
Carara & Son v Levy & Co argument of rule nisi granted by Court of Appeal as to mis-direction and weight of evidence Carara & Son v Levy & Co argument of rule nisi granted by Divisional Court as to excessive damages—to be argued with first rule by order Feb 21
Terry v Sharpe app of plts from order of Justices Grove, Lopes, and Manisty for new trial—action tried by Baron Huddleston Feb 27
Tagg v Gibbons argument of rule nisi for new trial granted by Court of Appeal —action tried by Mr Justice North—rule refused by Justices Grove, Lopes and Mathew Feb 28
Chapman v Turner app of plt in person from rule nisi discharged by Justices Grove, Lopes and Mathew—action tried by the Lord Chief Justice at Westminster March 1
Coker v The Bishop Stortford Union Rural Sanitary Authority and anr app of plt from order of Justices Grove and Mathew refusing order for delivery of particulars March 8
Ship The Hope (Liverpool) James McVie and anr v Owners of the Hope app of defts from interlocutory order of Sir R J Phillimore March 8
Webb v Stenton and ors app of plt from judgt of Justices Cave and Day on special case stated in action March 10
Newell v Buttifant and anr argument of rule nisi granted by Court of Appeal March 13
Fraser v Mason & anr app of defts of order of Justices Cave & Day March 15
Simmons v Berry app of defts from rule nisi for new trial discharged by Justices Lopes and Mathew March 15
Davis v Burton (Benja Blaiberg clt) app of claimant from order of Justices Cave and Day March 19
Gamin v Manger app of deft from Baron Pollock, Baron Huddleston and Mr Justice North, confirming order to strike out paragraph in plts' reply March 19
Palazzi v A Mocatta & Co, defts, and Carapatta and ors, clts app of defts from Justices Cave and Day refusing issue for trial and stay of action on payment into court March 20
Terry v Dowling app of deft from Justices Lopes and Mathew discharging rule nisi for new trial Mar 22
Turner and anr v Marriott and anr app of plt from Baron Huddleston and Mr Justice North dismissing actn against deft Jordan for want of prosecutn Mar 22
Cunnington v Gt Northern Ry Co app of plt from order of Justices Cave and Day for deft on demr Mar 22
Addison v Weston app of defts from Justices Cave and Williams confirming order for better answer to interrogatories Mar 28

FROM THE LONDON BANKRUPTCY COURT.

In re Bogue	Ex parte Ogle
In re Hemingway and anr	Ex parte Hauxmell and anr
In re Gathercole	Ex parte Green
In re Walker	Ex parte Du Welz
In re Chapple	Ex parte Izard
In re Phippen	Ex parte Phippen
In re Lyall and Co	Ex parte Waterhouse
In re Lyall and Co	Ex parte Auchincloss
In re Wood	Ex parte Hall
In re Bird	Ex parte Hill
In re Rymer	Ex parte Gasquet
In re Englehardt	Ex parte Englehardt
In re Harvey	Ex parte Coller

HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE.

CHANCERY DIVISION.

EASTER SITTINGS, 1883.

Causes for trial or hearing.

(Set down to Thursday, March 29th, inclusive.)

Before Vice-Chancellor BACON.

Causes for Trial (with witnesses and without witnesses).

Hull v Order demr

Sampson v Webb act
Neck v Moore act, wits
In re M A Green Green v Green act
In re Roberson, Campkin v Barton act

Transferred from Mr. Justice Fry, Mr. Justice Kay, and Mr. Justice Chitty, by order dated 17th Nov., 1882.
In re Godfrey, Godfrey v Faulkner act, wits
Beals v Romer act, wits
Young v Middleton act
Collyer v Isaacs act, wits
Vickerman v Longbourne act, wits
In re Hopcroft, Hopcroft v Hopcroft act, wits
King v King act, wits
Grant v Worshipful Company of Bakers act, wits
In re Nation Nation v Hamilton act
In re Cook Cook v Cook act
Cardiff, &c, Coal Co v Cory act, wits
Jones v Smith act
In re Newman Newman v Jaques act
English v Murray act, wits
Morgan v Scott act, wits
Elliott v Beard act, wits
Dreyfus v Peruvian Guano Co act, wits
Peruvian Guano Co v Bockwoldt act, wits
Smith v Andrews act, wits
In re Futcher, Futcher v Futcher act, wits
Young v Wallingford act, wits
Tetley v Manchester, &c, Ry Co act, wits
Gore v Universal Steam Tram Car Co act, wits
Whiter v Gill act, and counter-claim
Western v Marks act, wits

Set down since Transfer.

Rogers v Rogers m f j
Kay v Wright m f j
Kay v Wright m f j
Sherman v Sedgwick act
Wood v Barridge fur con and sumns
Davis v Crompton & Co act
Cosgrove v Cox m f j (short)
Watson v Johnson act
Matthews v Longmore m f j
Klein v The Real and Personal Advance Co act, wits
Lazarus v Cohen act, wits
In re W H Hodges, Hughes v Dean act
Duke v Smith, act wits
United Ports &c Co v Llewellin act wits
Spiller v Paris Skating Rink Co act (short)
Watkins v Barham act wits
Collins v Collins act
Chapman v Newson act
Watkins v Land Securities Co &c act wits
Bell v Sunderland Working Men's Socy &c act
Thompson v Cawston act wits
Watkin v Newcomen m f j
Hinde v Archer m f j
In re A F Fleschell, Harvey v Fleschell m f j
Chaston v Archer act wits
Bowers v Weedon act
Field v Park act
Charles v Jones m f j & motn pt hd
Tilly v Straker act wits
In re S Dendy, Watney v Smith m f j
In re Hiscoe, Hiscoe v Waite f c pt hd
Lumsden v Kidston act wits
Goodman v Randall act wits
In re Gomm, Wilcox v Gomm f c
Best v Best act & m f j
Spooner v Boyce act wits
Smith v The Bury &c Ry Co act wits

Transferred from Mr. Justice Fry, and Mr. Justice Chitty, by order dated February 22nd, 1883.
Byrne v Blenkarn act
Musgrove v Turner act
In re Arbon, Arbon v Burt m f j
In re Mercer, Ranyard v Lake m f j
Stevenson & Co v McCall act
In re J Crump, Bryan v Marston m f j
Sutcliffe v Trembling act & m f j
Wykeham v Musgrave m f j
Parker v Hooks act & m f j
In re E S Dawes, Darton v Allen act
Prince v Prince act wits
Maltine &c Co v Clarke & Co act
Ford v Mayor &c of Honiton act
Gibbons v Barnett m f j
Lloyd v Jones act wits
In re James, Garbutt v James act
Smith v Tennant act & m f j
In re M E Anstie, Chetwynd v Morgan pet & m f j
Hoare v Stephens m f j wits
Hanson v Chapman act & m f j wits
Scratton v Carter act wits
Webb v Smith and Goldsmith act wits
In re J Harris, Harris v Harris act wits
Fox v Day act wits
In re G Harrison, Harrison v Parry act wits
Carancho v Goldschmidt act
Winter v Ind Coope & Co act wits
Woodruffe v Green act wits
Watson v Cornell m f j
In re M Palmer, Skipper v Skipper act & m f j wits
Aldred v Assey m f j
Board of Works v London Gaslight Co act wits
Stamford &c Bkg Co v Graves act wits
Noy v Bush act wits
Semple v Davies act wits
Elliott v Lewis act wits
Senior v Whitely m f j
Lord Beresford v Fletcher act & m f j
Heywood v Mallalieu act wits
Manchester Val de Travers &c Co v Slagg act wits
Huggins v Hamlyn act wits
Marshall v Reynolds act wits
Morris v Baker act wits
In re W Robinson, Thompson v Robinson act wits
Fane v Dalton action wits
Wallis v Jackson m f j
In re Weare, Ikin v Mackenzie act
Lamplough v Sykes act wits
De Mauin v Burton act wits
Upperton v Smith, Smith v Upperton act wits
Helps v Jukes act wits
Fitzmaurice v Kelly act wits
Downs v Downs act
Hugenni v Lindsay act wits
Swail v Hood act wits
Natl Provincial Bank of England v Lithgo a & m f j wits
Ascough v Unwin act
Arnold v Arnold act

Set down since Transfer.

In re Whittaker, Whittaker v Whittaker f c
In re Pearce, McLean v Smith f c
Barrow v Stirrup act wits
In re R Moir, Warner v Moir act m f j
Matthews v Matthews act
In re F W Steinhauer, Steinhauer v Andrews m f j (short)
Brown v Black act wits
Lidstone v Williamson act
In re M Morrison, Jeffcot v Duncan act
In re J Hardingham, Brooks v Hardingham f c
Wingfield v King-Church act wits
In re Glanvill, Ellis v Johnson act
Lesiter v North Met Trams Co act wits
In re T O Lomax, Whitehead v Lomax act
Miller v Puckle f c
In re T B Myers, Rumball v Myers f c
Shetler v Dupuy f c
In re Palmer, Palmer v Bennett f c
In re Mellor, Mellor v Taylor f c
Hotham v Tucker act
In re W James, James v James f c
In re T E Willyams, Sandys v Williams m f j

Adjourned Summonses.

Cardiff &c Coal Co v Cory (expte T Cory & anr)
Same v Same (expte J Cory & anr)
Knox v Wells
In re Vaughan
In re The Brighton Livery Stables Co (expte Offord—2)
In re Hanne, Templeman v Hanne
In re Welford & Hussey, & V P Act 1874
In re Jopling, Coppin v Maughan
In re M J Lloyd, Hodgens v Wilton
Malladew v Malladew
In re Lewis, Kirby v Lewis (expte Pitt)
In re Same, Same v Same (expte Deft)
In re Collins's Settlement & V P Act 1874
In re Maxton, Shaw v Maxton
In re United Ports and General Insurance Co
Ashton v Aston
Bothamley v Weigel (ex pte A Weigel)
Same v Same (ex pte R H Moore)
De Mora v Concha
In re C R Jones and Settled Land Act
London Financial Assocn v Kelk
Vickerman v Longbourne
In re Finnis and V and P Act, &c (expte T Quested and anr)
Same v Same (ex pte Trustees of Tower Ward Schools)
In re Maisey Maisey v Maisey

Before Mr. Justice Fry.
Causes for Trial (with witnesses).

Wilson v De Coulon act
Price v Torrens act
Kemp v Bellyse act
Wright v Davis act
Scott (Bart) v Padwick act

Transferred from V.C. Hall by order dated Feb. 27, 1882.

Green v Clayton act
In re Beaumont Henson v Beaumont act

Set down since last Transfer.

Yetts v Compton act
Meux v Lord Tweedmouth
Sharp v Wegnelin act
Sharp v Vibert act
In re Potter Rees v Faulkner act
Nixon v Sheldon Sheldon v Nixon act
Sayers v Collier act
Lyon v Harrison act & m for j
Compton v Preston act
Sheldon v Nixon act
In re Gooch Brogden v Holmes act
Liddell v Newall act
Prior v Batch act
Edwards v Prior act
Davies v Turner act
Chapman v Clarke act
Ager v Peninsular &c Navigtn Co act
Attorney-General v Lyne act
Barber v Blaiberg act pt hd
Edwards v Cory act
Local Board &c of Witham v Oliver act
Ballard v Tomlinson act
Hawley v Carnel act
Render v Render act
Ager v Blacklock act
Charles v Smith act
West London Dairy Socy v Abbott act
Hunter v Ramsgate and Margate Trams Co act
In re Hunt, Robey v Hunt act
The Lydney and Wigpool Iron &c Co v Bird act
Leighton v Royal Courts of Justice Chambers Co act
Wintle v Crawshay act
Wintle v Crawshay act and m f j
Fellowes v Jeffries act
North v North act
Brown v Briggs act
Maclure v Slagg act
Burton v Gregory act
Patent Silvering Co v Padbury, Ware v Patent Silvering Co act
Jeffries v Jeffries act
Leech & Co v Marwick act
Tudor v Tudor act
Horne v Hunt act
Yetts v Billericay Union Sanitary Authority act
Holland v Sawbridge act
Hudson v Wootton act
Campbell v Reid act
In re C H Edmands Land &c Corporin v Edmands act
Bell v Browne act
Fletcher v Salisbury m f j
Thompson v Mayor &c of Sunderld act
City Bank v Sovereign Life Assce Co act
Ross v Ashwin act
Ord v Coombs act
Martin v Stratford act
Thomas v Spratly act
Barrett v Roberts act
Adams v Glynn act
Carrington v Black act
Voght v Stooks & Co act
Howe v Druce act
Beckett v Gill act
In re Pearson, Ozley v Scarth act
Barton v Thompson act
Hills v Thompson act

Adjourned Summonses.

In re Smith & Stott's Contract
In re The Public Supply Assocn limd & Co's Acts pt hd
In re The Cape Breton Co and Co's Act wits
Charlton v Charlton (expte W B Peat)
In re infants
In re Gloag & Miller & V P Act 1874
Ballard v Tomlinson
Ladd v Puleston & Nield, Puleston Brown & Co v Ladd
Dunning v Berridge
In re C Charlton Pauls v Charlton
Brown v Briggs
In re Taylor Illsley v Randall
In re Ball & Day's Contract Lydney &c Co v Bird
In re Bower Airey v Bower
Nott v Sands
In re Moore Hunt v Copping
Sweatman v Smith

Causes for Trial (without Witnesses), and Further Considerations.

Chisholm v Catiz Waterworks Co f c
In re Seymour Seymour v Hall act (not before Aol 23)
In re Parker Parker v Parker f c
In re Keen Cauner v Keen f c
In re Reichenbach's Estate Hodger v Biggs f c
In re Huggins Collis v Huggins act
Keay v Boulton m f j
Ward v Ward sp c
In re Paley Paley v Dixon f c
Arnold v Allen act
In re J H Kelsall Kelsall v London s c
In re Mocatta Mocatta v Mocatta s c
Wharton v Boffin act
In re W T Williams Pilkington v Franklen act
Hilbers v Parkinson s c
Leech v Marwick m f j
Fox v Suffield m f j
Robinson v Flint m f j
Firminger v Bruff act
In re Bannister Phillips v Bax act (short)
In re Limmer Limmer v Limmer m f j
In re Monkman Lyne v Monkman act
In re Dumble Williams v Murrell f c
In re H Oxenham Ford v Oxenham m f j (short)
In re Morgan Rees v Morgan m f j (short)
In re Newton Newton v Newton f c & sumns
Cook v Distin act (short)
In re Bartlett Newman v Hook f c
Marsden v Entwistle act
In re G Cooke Appleyard v Clarke m f j
In re Mitchel Mitchel v Fenton act and m f j
Smith v Owen m f j (short)
Morewood v Errington act & m f j
In re Smith Sandford v Sandford sp c & m f j
Spurrell v Spurrell m f j
Miles v Miles act and m f j
In re Turner Sherriff v Gover f c
Grace v Grace f c
In re Brettingham Melhado v Woodcock m f j (short)
In re Grant Walker v Martineau f c
Rackham v Bilby m f j (short)
Wheeler v Sharland act
Wilcox v Sharland act
Weavers' Co, London v Croll act
In re Edwards Palmer v Buchanan f c
Atkinson v Bury act
In re W Owen Lloyd v Owen act & m f j
Hollingshead v Pugh m f j

Before Mr. Justice Kay.
Causes for Trial (with witnesses.)

Thomas v Thomas act
Co of Propns of Norfolk Estuary v King's Lynn Dock Co act pt hd
Radalls v Payne act
Westaway v Hedger act
Carey v Birch act
Trivick v Brill act
Minnberson v Furnace act
Inglis v Combe act
Crosse v Waller act
Howe v Stainforth act
Surrey, &c, Canal v Hawley act
Austin v Accident Assurance Co, limd act
Shoolbred v Edwards act
Nicol v Beaumont act
Nixey v Webb act
Bliss v Ricketts act
Howell v Pink act
Wright v Duffy act
Heald v Sharples act
Leverett v Stearn act

In re Byrom, Moss v Byrom act
Lewis v Bailey act
Lancaster Banking Co v Brogden act
Hoyne v Kelly act
Seagrave v Kelly act and m f j
Hobbs v Lacey act
Brock v Vorley act
In re Croucher, Croucher v Croucher act
Watson v Christie act
Chester v Goble act and m f j
Bullock v Richards act and m f j
Thorneycroft v Guardians of Wellington Salop Union act
Phillips v First Avenue Hotel Co act
Silver Valley Mines v Beal act
Stibbard v Black act
Cooper v Roche act (short)
Tapley v Widdowson act
Ingold v Powell act
Wear v Johnson act
King v Lucas act
Martin v Collyer act
Cosby v Watson act
In re Stainer Stainer v Joyce act
Nickinson v Meredith act
Postlethwaite v Winder Ore Co act
Sheffield v Hall act
Appleby v Waring Bros act & m f j
Annandale v Swinburne act
Young v Ker act
Scholes v Webb act
Blackman v Blackman act
New Centrifugal Creamer Co v Hald & Co act
In re Marsden Gibbs v Loyland act
Ballard v Guardians of Poor of West Ashford Union act
In re Law Law v Law act
Gane v Myers act
White v Haymen act
Chitty v Bray act
Edwards v McClure act
Hill v Renardson act
Cull v Gudgeon act
Langford v Brown act
Nanney v Morgan act
Milner's Safe Co v Chalet Co, ld act
Corrie v Allen, R act
Corrie v Allen, G J act
Hamilton v Hambleton act
Ebbetts v Booth act
Blair v Stock act
The Eben Mining Co v Bain & Co act
Surrey Commercial Dock Co v Stotesbury act
Brady v Dove Dove v Brady act
In re G E Boyes Boyes v Carritt act
Rawlings v Woodall issues
Williams v Johnstone act
The Vase, &c, Co v Hill act

Causes for Trial (without witnesses).
In re W White Juby v Juby demr
Gore v Germon demr
In re Hewett Mayor, &c, of Gateshead v Hudspeth demr
The Republic of Peru v Ruzo m for d
Bacon v Camphausen act
Barnard v Groves m f j
In re T. Davies, Bedlake v Pascall sp c
In re C S Hawthorne Graham v Massey act pt hd
In re Branford Blake v Vincent act
In re Branford Branford v Branford m f j
Sheffield v Hall m f j
Blackman v Blackman m f j
Walker v Bunkell act
Gould v Tripp sp c
Corrie v Reddin act
In re Stansfield Mallinson v Rhodes sp c and m f j
Morgan v Davey m f j
Fane v Yeatman act
Booket v Wybourn m f j & sums
In re Glyn Glyn v Glyn s c & m f j
Walker v Brunkell m f j
Ruck v The Worshipful Co of Bakers act
In re Brown O'Halloran v King s c
In re Andros Andros v Andros s c
In re J Hamlyn In re W T B Hamlyn Hamlyn v Hamlyn act
Chester v Chester act
Ramskill v Edwards m f j
Little v Kingswold, &c Collieries Co act
Garratt v Pearson act
In re Foote Pope v Worthington act
In re Timmo Sartoris v Sartoris m f j
Arnold v Hughes act & m f j
Hankey v Martin act
Pocock v Gillham act
Greening v Ince act
Newton v Edwards act
Paget v Tollemache act & sums
In re J Rownson Field v White m f j
Co of Northam Bridge Roads v National Liberal Land Co m f j & mtn
In re Musson Davy v Harris act
Morris v Beal act
In re J Dean Ward v Holmes act
Brandon v Curtis m f j (short)
In re Eyre Eyre v Eyre m f j
Moreton v Worley act
In re Hazel Hazel v Hazel act (short)
Smith v Bennett Bennett v Smith act
In re L Keller Keller v Keller s c
Whitaker v Whitaker m f j (short)
Young v Harris act
Paul v Paul act
Roberts v Oppenheimer act
In re Franco Herbert v Tait m f j

Further Considerations.
In re Hawthorne Hawthorne v Kennedy f c & sums pt hd
In re John Simpson Simpson v Simpson f c pt hd
In re Bardsley Hall v Bardsley f c
Mould v Mould f c
In re A Sharp Dundas v Kersim f c
In re J G Wesbter Wigden v Wells f c sums
Jesse v Lloyd f c
In re Smedley Chesterfield &c Bkg Co v Smedley f c
Farrar v Sidebottom f c & sums
Window v Abbott f c
Hornby v Ratcliffe f c
In re Collins Stoker v Stoker Longbottom v Stoker f c
Shaw v Ford f c
De Bussche v Alt f c & sums
De la Pole v Dick f c
Oliver v Oliver f c
In re Goulston Goulston v Goulston f c
In re Clarke Clarke v Stanes f c
In re Chapman Chapman v Chapman f c
In re Crace Crace v Norris f c
In re Tully Tully v Walker f c
In re Barratt Oates v Barratt f c
Adjourned Summonses.
In re Gosden Gosden v Scott pt hd
In re S Barber Christie v Sweet (Ex parte W Barber No 1)
In re Same Same v Same (expte W Barber No 2)
Evans v The Mona Mines, limd
In re The English and French Bk and Co's Acts
In re W C Corsellis Lawton v Elwes (Nov 30, 1882)
In re Same Same v Same (Jan 8, 1883)
Whitehaven Union v The Cockermouth Union, &c (Aug 4, 1882)
Same v Same (Jan 15, 1883)
Willats v Flint
In re Foskett Waller v Foskett
In re Hollier's Estate Winter v Dowell
Hawksley v Pugh
In re Watson, Kipling and Co
In re Ahloowalia Ahloowalia v Ahloowalia (ex pte plt) & motn
In re Same Same v Same (ex pte deft)
In re Middlesborough, Redcar, & Co, Building Co
Brogden v Brunles
In re Arcedeckne Atkins v Arcedeckne
Lee v Cranidge
Digby v Jones Jones v Digby Digby v Jones
In re Solomon's Estate Levy v Jacobs
Craven v Ingham (ex pte E Craven)
Craven v Ingham (ex pte O Craven)
In re J Bennetts' Estate In re M A Bennetts' Estate Bennetts v Pemburthy
In re City of London Co-operative Assocn, limd
In re Williams, Slack, & Son, limd
In re Manchester and Milford Ry Co
Greening v Ince
In re John Walker's Trusts & Settled Land Act, 1882
In re Cornwall Minerals Ry Co & Co's Acts
In re The Romford Canal (Trickett's claim)
In re Same (Pocock's claim)
In re Same (Carew's claim)
In re Lulham's Estate Brunton v Lulham
Worsley v Levy
Postlethwaite v Winder Iron Ore Co
Waynes Merthyr Co v Powell's Duffryn Steam Coal, &c, Co
In re Farber to Davis & V & P Act
In re Hallett to Martin & V & P Act
Bund v Green
N.B.—On or about April 16, and during the absence of Mr. Justice Kay on the Spring Circuit, the business of his lordship's court will be continued by Mr. Justice Pearson.

Before Mr. Justice CHITTY.
Causes for Trial (with witnesses).
Skipworth v Sayle act
Hoole v Brown act
Klinker v Newton act
Lumb v Mackerell act
In re Elliot, decd Hardy v Elliot act
In re Morant, decd Morant v Manson act
Thomas v Palin act
London & North-Western Ry Co v Keighley act
Conolan v Leyland act (Liverpool)
Coates v London Works, limd sums and act (cross-exmn.) by order
Stevenson v Hooper ad sums with wits by order
Hutchins v Butler motn to be treated as trial of act with wits by order
In re J. Reed pet with wits by order
In re James Truman's Est Dawbarn v Truman adj sums
Sheppard v Hovell adj sums
Dixon v Mason act
In re Hy Taylor's Estate Taylor v Taylor (Hodgson's claim) adj sums
McAndrew v Indian Mammoth Gold Mines ld act
Oldreve v Knowles (Nash's case) adj sums with witns by order
In re Rowe's Trade Mark "Oroide" motn by Taylor and Co to rectify register with witns by order
Mayor, &c, of Norwich v Browne act
Backhouse v Alcock act
Tomkins v Whale act
Sumburg Mining Co v Hamilton act & sums (transferred from Q B Division)
Mapleson v Hutchinson act (May 1)
In re Oldfield Road Loan Society & Co's Acts (Thompson's claim) adj sums with wits by order
In re Adams, decd Adams v Adams act (1881—A—1,165)
In re The Patent Nut and Bolt Co and Trade Marks Act (Ibbetson's opposition) expte the Co adj sums
Backhouse v Robson act & m f j
Digby v Evans act
In re Elizabeth Doble Doble v Doble act
Doble v Doble act
In re Jones' Trade Mark adj sums
Danes-Cooke v Power act (June 10)
Coulter v Smith Smith v Coulter original act and counter claim
Robertson v Poland act
Gething v The Lewis Merthyr Navn Co ld act
Roberts v Kelly act
Selwyn v Jones act
Manchester and Salford Bank limd v Flitcroft act m f j
Baron Raglan v Stocks act
Cooper v Bullen act
Anley v Leah act
Reid v The London and Staffordshire Fire Insurance Co limd act
Boughey v Booth act
Wilkins v The Mayor &c of Birmingham act
Bowen v Llewellyn act
The Lewis Merthyr Navn Co ld v Gething act
Leon v Tyler act
Shepherd v Goulston act
Perry v Jacob act
Earl Cawdor v The Llanelly Board of Health act
Morrison v Wade-Gery act
Edwards v Edwards act
Walker v Ryan act
De Barnthy v Croneigh act
Macdonald v Underwood act
The Lands Securites Co ld v Bascomb & ors act
In re Pritchard & Dodd's application & Messrs W. Waller & Co's opposition & Trade Marks Act adjd sums, wits
Bedder v Maclean act
Devon & Cornwall Electric Light and Power Co v Collins act
Wright v Taylor act
Disher & Co v Best act
Capper v Blatchley act
Non-witness Causes, Adjourned Summonses and Special Causes.
York City &c Bank Yorkshire Banking Co procedure sumns pt hd
Pearson v Flagstaff Silver Mining Co procedure sumns
Attorney-General v Corporation of Dartmouth act pt hd
Thomas v Viner Viner v Thomas act
In re Northern Counties of England Fire Insurance Co (Gilliat's Case) adjd sumns
In re Lager Beer Brewery, ltd (Schroder's claim) adjd sumns
In re Great Eastern Glaciarium Co, ltd (John Tanner's case) adjd sumns
In re The Same Co, limd (Henry Wm Tanner's case) adj sums
In re Brown's Estate Pothecary v Little (Power & ors' claim) adj sumns
In re M A B Wilkinson, decd Wilkinson v Wilkinson adjd sumns
In re H N Pym, a Solicitor adjd sumns (taxation of costs)
In re Hick's Estate Gervis v Hooper adjd sumns
In re Hulkes, decd, Powell v Hulkes act (S O till completion of evidence)
Castell v Hutchinson act
Duke of Wellington v Brand act April 2
Dent v Dent act
In re T W Edwards's Estate Harley v Scott adjd sumns
In re Pensam, decd Dyer v Pensam act
In re Artistic Colour Printing Co ltd (Chappell's case) adj sumns
In re Smith, Knight, & Co, ld adj sumns
Syers v Blenkarn act
Vine v Raleigh adj sumns
Wilson v Duguid sp c & m f j
In re North-Eastern Industrial Permanent Building Society & Schott and V & P Act adj sumns
Farnell v Farnell adj sumns
In re Newton, decd Dunn v Dunn sp c
Clayton v Day act
Carter v Hine adj sumns
Conybeare v Lewis adj sumns
In re Queenborough Chemical Society (Bagehole's case) adj sumns
Stevens v Mid Hants Ry Co adj sumns
Gray v Lucas adjd sumns
In re Lord Kensington's Estate Beaumont v Ford adjd sumns
In re Childer's Estate Wilkinson v Richardson adjd sumns
Chaytor v Straubenzee special case
In re Hanhart and Gillman adj sumns
In re Angove, a Solicitor adj sumns
In re Lines and Prudential Assce Co, limd, and V and P Act adj sumns
In re J. H. Bell, decd Lave v Bell (Parker's claim) adjd sumns
Huyshe v Lord Scarsdale special case and m f j
Dahne v Lovegrove special case
Prichard v Harper special case and m f j
In re The Mercantile Mutual Marine Insurance Assocn, limd adj sums
Foster v Elsley adj sumns
Fletcher v Hadwen s c & m for j
In re Thorley, decd Foden v Thorley sp c & m f j
Powerscourt to Army and Navy Co-operative Society and V & P Act adj sumns
In re Wrey's Estate Sargeant v Smith Weld v Weld Weld v Knight adj sumns
In re Henry Smith's Estate Smith v France adj sumns
In re Henry Byng, decd Ede v Byng s c
In re Burnett, decd Burnett v Footner s c
In re Northern Counties Bank ld (Darnell's case) adj sumns
In re Hinchliffe, decd Hinchliffe v Hinchliffe s c & m for j
In re Storforth Lane Colliery Co ld (Whatley's case) adj sumns
In re Sophia Phillip's Estate Jacobs v Wake adj sumns
In re Oak Pitts Colliery Co ld (ex pte Lloyd) adj sumns
In re Anna Tyson's Estate Higgs v Spurgeon adj sumns

In re Northern Counties Bank ld (Hutchinson's case) adj sumns
In re Joseph Wright & Co (claims) adj sums
Pussey v Armstrong adj sums
In re H A Revell's Estate (claim of Low and anr) adj sums
In re W Pearson's Estate Foster v Pearson adj sums
Peruvian Guano Co v Raw adj sums
In re The Hoxton Estate Charity adj sums
In re The Fire Insurance Corporation ld (ex pte Freeman) adj sums
Boardman v Boardman act (re-transferred from V C Bacon)
In re Midland Land and Investment Corporation ld (claim of Commnrs of Sewers) adj sums
In re Walker's Estate Walker v Walker adj sums
Blanchard v Hyde adj sums
In re Hopkins's Estate Hopkins v Gatton adj sumns
In re Jno Graves (review taxation) adj sums
Weld v Spearman act
In re Bowyer, decd Biddulph v Astorg s c
In re Stratford, decd Malcolm v Stratford s c
In re The Rosedale and Ferry &c Co adj sumns
Tate v The Anglo-Russian &c Co adj sumns
Hamilton v Robinson s c & m f j
In re Warner's Settled Estate Warner's Settled Estate and V & P Act adj sumns
Attorney-Gen v Duke of Northumberland adj sumns
In re Florence Land &c Co (Nicol's case) adj sumns
In re Briton Ferry and Swansea Steam Tramways Co (Clayton's claim) adj sums
Wigfield v Brown (ex pte Willmer) m to discharge receiver &c (to come on with non-wits acts, by order of Dec 17)
Atlantic Mutual Insurance Co v Huth adj sumns
Hinn v Reid s c & m f j
Midland Land & Investment Corptn v Visct Sudley & ors act
In re Munch's Trade Mark adjd sumns
In re Southport, &c Banking Co (ex pte Bath) adj smns
In re Clinger Cotton Shed Co (Edmondson's case) adjd sumns (S. O. till 7 days after Barker's case is heard)
In re The Same Co (Barker's case) adjd sumns
In re J B Purvis, decd Ramsay v Reed s c
Pearse v Harvey adj smns
Quilter v Tod-Heatly m f j
In re Verity, decd Verity v Verity m f j
In re Evans, decd Secker v Hardisty adj smns
In re La Conception Gold Mining Co ld adj smns
Ormes v Bateman adj smns
In re Dennett, decd Simkins v Dennett s c & m f j
Wollaston v Wollaston s c
In re Chs Denham & Co (2) adj smns
In re Clay's Estate Van Sandan v Tindale adj smns
In re Duckworth & Chase's Contract & V & P Act 1874 adj smns
In re Rollinson's Estate Wakefield &c Bank v Rollinson adj smns
The Imperial Water & Gas Corpn ld v Clayton m f j
In re Marsh, decd Gowland v Gray s c
Antrobus v Trotter s c
In re Edmonds, decd Sharland v Wrench adj smns
In re Colonial Trusts Corpn adj smns
In re The Florence Land and Public Works Co ld (claim of Anglo-Italian Bank) adj smns
Kelsall v Caddick (pltff) adj smns
In re Young and ors adj smns
In re Folliott, decd Mears v Walker s c
In re B W Ground, decd Ground v Ground act
Turnour v Turnour m f j
In re Cwm Avon Estate and Water Works Co (expte Shaw, adjd sum
Bulmer v Bulmer m f j

In re T Pearson decd Pearson v Pearson adj summons
Mills v Dewberry act
Close v Carr act
Attorney-Gen v Whiteley act
Clements v Horton m f j
In re The London Fish Market and National Fishery Co ld (2) adj sumns
Brace v Attorney-Gen act
Warwick v Knight act
Clifton v Knight act
In re James decd Garbett v James act
Baziley v Royal Exchange Assurance Co act
Mitchell v Josse adj sumns
Ward v Eyre (Pltfs sumns) adj sumns
Ward v Eyre (Defts sumns) adj sumns
Booth v Lothwin act (short)
Scarth v Sharp act
Treffry v Treffry act
In re May's Estate Whitechurch v Batley adj sumns
In re Lambert Gray & Co (Lyonnaise case) adj sumns
In re the same Co Lefebores case ad sms
Levetus v Newton (ex Plaintiff) adj sms review taxn
In re W S Webster adjd sumns
In re G L Routgen's Estate Perkins v Perkins act
In re George Perkin's Estate adj sumns
In re Revill decd Leigh v Rumney act
Staunton v Pettifer act
Foalkes v The Quartz Consolidated Gold Mining Co ld act
The Callao Bis Gold Mining Co v Downes act
In re The Swiss Unsweetened Milk Co adj sums
Daniels v Constable m f j (short, April 14)
In re L Strombom's Estate adj sums
Tiddeman v Alexander act
Wootton v Strudwick m f j
Kelsall v Caddick adj sums
In re Turner, decd Turner v Spencer act
Wyke v Holder act
Ferguson v Charsley act
Bouskell v Barnett m f j (short)
Price v The Bala and Festiniog Ry Co act
Duckers v Smedley act
Gething v Keighley adj sums
In re Spencer, decd Spencer v Spencer m f j (short)
In re Eyres, decd Eyres v Shuter m f j (short)

Further Considerations.

Harrison v Rhodes f c pt hd
Formby v Smith f c & sums to vary, pt hd
Weld v Knight Weld v Weld f c
Mayd v Mayd f c (May 1)
In re Wilde, decd Sawbridge v Wilde f c
Horrell v Brent f c
Hodgson v Franklin f c
Barber v Adshead f c
In re Sir G W Denys, Bart Roper v Brunton f c
In re Bradshaw, decd Brittain v Bradshaw f c
In re Cochrane, decd Cochrane v Cochrane f c
Nettlefold v Nettlefold f c
In re Meadows, decd Fox v Brandreth f c
In re Wortley, decd Culley v Wortley f c
In re Boddill, decd Boddill v Smallpage f c
Cottle v Cottle f c

Demurrers.

Mowatt v The Milford Dock Co demr of deft E R Spearman to claim
Jones v Jones demr of deft to claim
Cely-Trevilian v Lanerton demr of deft to claim

Before Mr. Justice PEARSON.
Causes for Trial (with witnesses).

In re Sharpe Sharpe v Sharpe act (not before April 17)
Benham v Irvine act (not before Apr 9)
Rogerson v Young act (not before Apr 9)
Plumptre v Blaxland act
Ward v Ward act
Ormes v Bateman act

Transferred from V.C. Hall, Mr Justice Fry, and Mr. Justice Chitty, by order dated May 25, 1882.

Winby v Cardiff District &c Trams Co ld act V C Hall
Gandy v Reddaway act Fry, J Apr 9
Smith v Hamilton act Fry, J
In re Harcourt, decd Danby v Tucker act Chitty, J
Holsner v Lamb act Chitty, J

Transferred from Mr. Justice Chitty, by order dated Nov. 17, 1882.

Barrow v Nicholson act
Badische Anilin and Soda Fabrik v Levinstein act, pt hd
Beck v Cullum act
Goodman v Batty act
In re Mitchell, decd Taylor v Harrison act (not before April 12)
In re Blackwell, decd Hansell v Legge act (not before April 15)
Berridge v Pease act
Kendrick v Roberts act
Espir v Mainwaring act
Hamilton v University Life Assce scy act (not before April 11)
Hotson v Slipper act
Morgan v Games act
Smith v Hurst act
Hall v Bovey act
Sheffield Waterworks v Bingham act
Pringle v Pierce act
Kensit v Great Eastern Ry Co act
Blyth v Guinness Mahon & Co act
Barrett v White act
In re Loe, decd Loe v Loe act
In re Smith, decd Campbell v Smith act
Birch v Mather act

Transferred from Mr. Justice Chitty, by order dated Feb. 22, 1883.

Nichols v Nichols act
Vint v Hudspith Vint v Hudspith act
Hewett v Mansel act
In re Defries, decd Nordon v Levy act
Law v Garrett act
Davies v Chisholm act
Wilson v Globe Accident Insurance Co act
De Zuccato v Fairholme act
In re Maddever, decd Three Towns Banking Co ld v Maddever act
Owen v Emery Owen v Emery act
Chatterley v Nicholls act
Goldschmidt v Oddy act
Barlow v Daw act
Holloway v The Gas Light and Coke Co act
Day, Noakes, & Co v Edmonds act
Bellmore v Watson act
Langen v Tate act
Williamson v Coward act
Palliser v County of Gloucester Banking Co act
Wills v Luff & Van Trump act
Willams v Greene act
Scott v Secretary of State for India in Council act

Bolton v Swansea and Mumbles Ry Co act
Alt v Norman act
Minto v Clark act
Galliers v Galliers act
Cutler v Picard act
Duckworth v Anderson act
Muggeridge v Vivian act & m f j
Wootton v Strudwick m f j
Young v Fawcus act
Leah v Clegg act
Bevington v Harnshaw act
Johnson v Rock Permanent Building Society act
Sumner v Williams act
Freeman v Freeman act
Beasley v Beasley act
Cumming v Digby act
Bowm v Humber and ors act
Truman v L B & S C Ry Co act
Wallis v Watson act
Wyatt v Meadows act
Hotchkiss v Gardner Gun Co act
Groves v Lucas act
Hawkins v Hawkins act
Blakey v Fieldhouse act
Hickman v Saunders act
Woodman v Harvey act
Cleather v Twisden act
Dean v Twisden act
Bryant v Young act
Mandy v Morrish act
Sadler v Marks Sadler v Harris act
In re Dale, decd Dale v Dale act
Satow v Satow act
Casson v Pickles act
In re G Armitage, decd Smith v Armitage act
Lounds v Homer act
Taylor v Hoare act
Tone v Preston act
Smith v Land & House Property Corpn ld act
Ward v Sharp act
Raimondi v Great Western Ry Co act
Woodhouse v Spurgeon act
Weller v Stone act
Westall v Hall & Co act
Sugg & Co ld v Bray & Co act
Bulpett v Habershon & Rope act
Porter v The London & N W Ry Co act
Miller v Walker act
Sandgate Board of Health v Lency act
Gloucestershire Bkng Co v Cornford act
In re J Heatie, decd Gloucestershire Bkng Co v Cornford act
Hayne v Gardner act
Bowser v Sharp act
Weston v Sherwell act
Bissell v Redway act

N.B.—On or about the 16th of April, and during the absence of Mr. Justice Kay on the Spring Circuit, Baron Pollock will sit in Queen's Bench Court I., and take the Actions in the Chancery Division assigned for Trial only to Mr. Justice Pearson.

COMPANIES.

WINDING-UP NOTICES.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

WELLS AND COMPANY, LIMITED.—Petition for winding up, presented March 28, directed to be heard before Chitty, J., on Saturday, April 7. Plunkett and Leader, St Paul's churchyard, solicitors for the petitioner

[*Gazette*, March 30.]

LONDON FISH MARKET AND NATIONAL FISHERY COMPANY, LIMITED.—Petition for winding up, presented April 2, directed to be heard before Chitty, J., at the Royal Courts of Justice, on April 14. Norton, Queen st, Cheapside, solicitor for the petitioners

WEST MINERA MINING COMPANY, LIMITED.—Petition for winding up, presented March 31, directed to be heard before Fry, J., on Friday, April 13. Rogers and Chave, Gt Winchester st bldgs, solicitors for the petitioners

[*Gazette*, April 3.]

SALES OF THE ENSUING WEEK.

April 10.—Mr. WALTER PARISH, at the Mart, at 2 p.m., Leasehold Properties (see advertisement, this week, p. 4).

April 11.—Messrs. EDWIN FOX & BOUSFIELD will let by auction at the Mart, at 2 p.m., Building Site (see advertisement, March 31, p. 4).

April 12.—Messrs. C. C. & T. MOORE, at the Mart, at 1 for 2 p.m., Freehold and Leasehold Estates (see advertisement, this week, p. 4).

April 12.—Messrs. THURGOOD & MARTIN, at the Mart, at 2 p.m., Freehold Property (see advertisement, March 31, p. 4).

RECENT SALES.

At the Stock and Share Auction and Advance Company's (Limited) sale, held at their sale-room, Crown-court, Old Broad-street, E.C., on the 5th inst., the following were among the prices obtained:—City of London Fire Insurance £10 shares, £1 paid, 18s.; Alexandra Hotel, £10 to 10½; Faversham Brickfields Mortgage Debentures, 25s.; Richmond Consolidated £5 shares, 6¾; Indian Consolidated, 4s. 9d.; Columbian Hydraulic, 6s.; Max Greger, 16s. 3d.; and other miscellaneous securities fetched fair prices.

BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

BIRTHS.

BATTEN.—March 30, at 19, Cadogan-place, S.W., the wife of H. Cary Batten, of the Inner Temple, barrister-at-law, of a son.

HERSCHELL.—April 4, at 46, Grosvenor-gardens, the wife of Sir Farrer Herschell, M.P., Solicitor-General, of a daughter.

MAIDLOW.—March 31, at 1, Cleveland-terrace, Hyde-park, the wife of John Mott Maidlow, of Lincoln's-inn, barrister-at-law, of a daughter.

WETHERFIELD.—March 28, the wife of Henry W. M. Wetherfield, solicitor, of a son.

MARRIAGE.

TURNER—DUNLOP.—March 29, at Wrecclesham, Percy Pollixfen Vere Turner, barrister-at-law, to Emma, daughter of the late Robert Buchanan Dunlop, of Drumhead, Dumbartonshire.

DEATHS.

MORRIS.—March 27, at Newfoundpool, Leicester, Charles Morris, solicitor, aged 69.

ROYLE.—March 28, at 10, Oakfield-road, Tollington-park, N., Horace John Royle, solicitor, of 5, Bedford-row, W.C., aged 31.

SNOWDEN.—April 1, at Hongkong, Francis Snowden, Senior Puisne Judge of H. M. Supreme Court of Hongkong, aged 55.

LONDON GAZETTES.

Bankrupts.

FRIDAY, March 30, 1883.
Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.
Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.
To Surrender in London.

Sutton, Graham Manners, Finch lane, Stockbroker. Pet Mar 16. Pepys. Apr 11 at 1

To Surrender in the Country.

Boulthy, Charles, Nottingham, Furniture Dealer. Pet Mar 28. Patchitt. Nottingham, Apr 16 at 3

Gabbott, William, Walsden, Lancaster, Manufacturer. Pet Mar 22. Hartley. Burnley, Apr 12 at 2.30

TUESDAY, April 3, 1883.
Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.
Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.
To Surrender in the Country.

Bagguley, Edward, Newcastle under Lyme, Stafford, Baker. Pet Mar 30. Keary. Stoke upon Trent, Apr 19 at 3

Draper, William, Balsall Heath, Worcester, Commission Agent. Pet Mar 29. Cole. Birmingham, Apr 16 at 2

Elliott, George, New Scarborough, York, Builder. Pet Mar 30. Bury. Barnsley, Apr 20 at 11.30

Ford, John, Hardingstone, Northampton, Tailor. Pet Mar 31. Faulkner. Northampton, Apr 21 at 11

Gouldby, James, Horton, Dorset, Innkeeper. Pet Mar 29. Dickinson. Poole, Apr 14 at 11

Maile, George, New Thornton Heath, nr Croydon, Builder. Pet Mar 30. Rowland. Croydon, Apr 17 at 11

Stenning, Frederick, Waltham Cross, Hertford, Builder. Pet Mar 28. Pulley. Edmonton, Apr 17 at 12

BANKRUPTCIES ANNULLED.

FRIDAY, March 30, 1883.

Rees, Joseph Cook, Neath, Glamorgan, Builder. Mar 20

TUESDAY, April 3, 1883.

Colley, John Leigh, Starcross, Devon, Captain in the Militia. Mar 15

Liquidations by Arrangement.

FIRST MEETINGS OF CREDITORS.

FRIDAY, March 30, 1883.

Ambrose, Henry Charles, Hertford, Butcher. Apr 18 at 2.30 at office of Armstrong, Fore st, Hertford

Amer, Thomas, Bristol, Beer Retailer. Apr 6 at 12 at office of Essery, Broad st, Bristol

Barber, Thomas, Birmingham, Wine Merchant. Apr 13 at 4 at office of Laundy and Co, Chancery lane

Bell, Rev. John Robert Kennedy, Llansaintffraid Deytheur, Montgomery. Apr 9 at 12 at Wynnstay Hotel, Oswestry. Pughe, Llanfillin

Brumby, Joshua, Liverpool, Car Proprietor. Apr 16 at 3 at office of Gibson and Bolland, South John st, Liverpool

Catchpole, John Stephen, Gosbeck, Suffolk. Apr 14 at 10.30 at office of Gooding, Tower st, Ipswich

Chestle, Thomas, Whitechapel rd, no occupation. Apr 3 at 11 at office of Mills, South sq, Gray's inn

Clarke, Thomas Walter, Gt Torrington, Devon, Tailor. Apr 13 at 12 at office of Smale, Bridgeland st, Bideford

Clement, Alfred, High st, Clapham, Builder. Apr 17 at 2 at office of Rodgers and Clarkson, Walbrook

Cragg, William, Heaton Norris, Lancaster, Licensed Victualler. Apr 17 at 11 at office of Browne and Ainsworth, St Peter's gate, Stockport

Critchlow, Thomas, Burslem, Stafford, Joiner. Apr 7 at 11 at office of Alcock, Newcastle st, Burslem

Crofts, Thomas, Burton-on-Trent, Stafford, Fruiterer. Apr 9 at 12 at office of Wilson, Burton-on-Trent

Davies, John, Swansea, Glamorgan, Outfitter. Apr 6 at 3 at office of Evans and Davies, Wind st, Swansea

Dawson, Joseph, sen, Leicester, Factor. Apr 12 at 12 at office of Harvey, Selborne bldgs, Millstone lane, Leicester

Day, Alfred, Mount Pleasant rd, Hornsey, Dealer in Game. Apr 6 at 3 at Sutton Arms, Carthusian st. Wright, Quality ct, Chancery lane

Deas, William, North Shields, Northumberland, Fish Salesman. Apr 16 at 11 at office of Scott, Pilgrim st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne

Dilly, Henry, Salisbury, Wilts, Rope Manufacturer. Apr 19 at 3 at Cannon st Hotel. Kelsey

Fox, George Wakefield, Manchester, Castor Oil Merchant. Apr 24 at 3 at office of Norton, Brasenose st, Manchester

Frankland, Stephen, Nelson, nr Burnley, Lancaster, Stonemason. Apr 20 at 3 at Lord Nelson Inn, Nelson, nr Burnley. Hartley, Burnley

Furness, Benjamin, Stanley Lane End, nr Wakefield, York, Grocer. Apr 9 at 3.30 at office of Kent, Barstow sq, Wakefield

Gibbs, Edwin, Sutton St James, Lincoln, Miller. Apr 19 at 11.30 at office of Oliver, York row, Wisbech

Greenwood, Howarth, Lobmill, nr Todmorden, York, Grocer. Apr 13 at 11 at Queen Hotel, Todmorden. Shackleton, Todmorden

Hall, Henry, Halesowen, Worcester, Fruiterer. Apr 10 at 11 at office of Oldshaw, High st, Blackheath, Rowley Regis

Harrington, Isaac, Stockton-on-Tees, Durham, Milliner. Apr 19 at 12 at office of Clift, Cheapside

Hill, Jethro Jepthah, Church row, High st, Wandsworth, Grocer. Apr 9 at 12 at office of Carter and Bell, Eastcheap

Hill, Jonathan, Scarborough, York, Hosier. Apr 6 at 3 at office of Appleyard, Huntriss row, Scarborough

Hinves, George, Huntingdon st, Kingsland rd, Gasfitter. Apr 7 at 11 at office of Mackay, Kingsland rd. Biggenden, Kingsland rd

Holden, William, Bolton, Lancaster, Baker. Apr 18 at 3 at Public Rooms, Bowker's row, Bolton. Dowling and Urry, Bolton

Hollmuller, Frederick James Haydon, Pitfield st, Hoxton, Tobacconist. Apr 4 at 4 at office of Hanson, King st, Cheapside. Myers, Gresham buildings, Basinghall st

Howell, John, and William Howell, Walthamstow, Plumbers. Apr 7 at 12 at office of Lewis, Workman's Hall, Stratford

Hulley, George, Ashton-under-Lyne, Builder. Apr 13 at 3 at office of Clayton and Wilson, Ashton-under-Lyne

Jones, John David, Resolven, nr Neath, Glamorgan, Grocer. Apr 5 at 11 at office of Sims, Queen st, Neath

Krauss, John Adam, Bow Common lane, Baker. Apr 9 at 2 at office of Nears, Friday st, Cheapside

Lane, James Vernon, Newent, Gloucester, Grocer. Apr 13 at 3 at office of Collins, Broad st, Bristol. Dighton, Newent

Lane, William, Temple Gulting, Gloucester, Farmer. Apr 10 at 12 at office of Moores and Romney, Tewkesbury

Lang, Hickman, Crewkerne, Somerset, Hotel Keeper. Apr 10 at 3 at Swan Hotel, Crewkerne. Sparkes and Blake, Crewkerne

Leach, John, and Joseph Green Leach, Bingley, York, Manufacturers. Apr 5 at 3 at office of Neill and Broadbent, Kirkgate, Bradford

Manning, Joseph, Birmingham, Tailor. Apr 12 at 11 at office of O'Connor, Bennett's hill, Birmingham

McKenzie, James Duncan, Jarrow, Durham, Tailor. Apr 14 at 11 at office of Duncan and Duncan, Market pl, South Shields

McNulty, John, Hartlepool, Durham. Apr 17 at 2.30 at office of Edger, Town wall, Hartlepool

Mellor, John, and Robert Mellor, Bolton, Clog Iron Makers. Apr 13 at 11 at office of Cooper, Mawdsley st, Bolton

Moore, James, Church rd, Islington, Provision Merchant. Apr 9 at 11 at office of Chilcott, St Martin's lane

Murfet, George, Fordham, Cambridge, Coal Dealer. Apr 18 at 3 at office of Bendall, Soham

Newland, Robert, Church rd, Battersea, Coach Painter. Apr 7 at 3 at Eagle Hotel, Ladbroke grove rd, North Kensington. Hope, Bell yd

Newton, Charles, Belgrave, Leicester, Publichouse Manager. Apr 12 at 3 at office of Wright and Co, Belvoir st, Leicester

Partridge, Joseph, Highweek, Devon, Coachbuilder. Apr 14 at 12 at Seven Stars Inn, Newton Bushel. Creed. Newton Abbot

Payne, William, and William Robert Payne, Witney, Oxford, Carriers. Apr 11 at 1 at Marlborough Hotel, Witney. Ravenor, Witney

Poole, John, Parkholme rd, Dalston, House Decorator. Apr 6 at 12 at office of Harrison, Pancras lane

Quelch, George, Sudbury, Saddler. Apr 7 at 10 at Eagle Hotel, Ladbroke grove rd, North Kensington. Hope, Bell yd

Ramm, Sarah, out of business. Apr 10 at 1 at Ridler's Hotel, Holborn. Clabburn, Norwich

Sandiford, Samuel Frith, and Alexander Miller, Manchester, Wool Bleachers. Apr 11 at 3 at Grosvenor Hotel, Deansgate, Manchester. Sampson, Manchester

Savage, Herbert, York Town, Surrey, Bookseller. Apr 16 at 12 at office of Plumbe and Leader, St Paul's churchyard

Schofield, William, Hyde, Chester, Toy Dealer. Apr 12 at 3 at Merchants' Hall, Oldham st, Manchester. Drinkwater

Schutte, Antonio Luis, and Moritz Wilhelm Kramer, Billiter st, Merchants. May 25 at 2 at office of Turquand and Co, Coleman st. Druces & Co

Skinner, John, Wharf lane, Acton lane, Willesden, Bricklayer. Apr 18 at 3 at office of Boxall and Boxall, Chancery lane

Stembridge, Samuel, Leicester sq, Sauce Manufacturer. Apr 16 at 3 at office of Henderson, Moorgate st. Aird, Philpot lane

Stubley, George, Wath upon Dearne, York, Grocer. Apr 12 at 11 at office of Marsden and Co, Westgate, Wakefield

Swalwell, Benjamin, Carterthorne, Durham, Joiner. Apr 11 at 11.30 at office of Edgar, Silver st, Bishop Auckland

Taylor, William, Brighton, Grocer. Apr 11 at 3 at office of Nye, North st, Brighton

Walsh, Ralph, Breightmet, Lancaster, Provision Merchant. Apr 16 at 2 at 43, Church st, Liverpool. Pennington and Horrocks, Bolton

Wheeler, James Henry, Cheltenham, Brewer. Apr 7 at 12 at office of Smith, Corn Exchange, Cheltenham.

Whitehead, Robert Hey, Rothwell, York, Stone Merchant. Apr 12 at 3 at Queen Hotel, Leeds. Dibb and Co, Leeds

Wicks, John, jun, Lewes, Sussex, Grocer's Assistant. Apr 17 at 1 at North Gate House, Pavilion, Brighton. Champion

Williams, Daniel, Lower Sloane st, Chelsea. Apr 7 at 1 at office of Smith, Leadenhall st

Worboys, John Lowth, Maida vale, Kilburn, Butcher. Apr 13 at 2 at office of Pierce, Giltspur st

Wright, John Robert George, Hornshay st, Canterbury rd, Old Kent rd, Builder. Apr 5 at 12 at Masons' Hall Tavern, Masons' avenue, Basinghall st. Martin, London Wall

TUESDAY, April 3, 1883.

Anslow, Henry, and Ellis John Anslow, Wolverhampton, Grocers. Apr 19 at 3 at office of Dallow, Queen st, Wolverhampton

Arkell, Thomas, Gilbert st, Oxford st, Boot Manufacturer. Apr 16 at 3 at Boot and Shoe Manufacturers' Association and Leather Trades' Protection Society Incorporated. Chapman, Pancras lane

Arthur, Charles Archibald, Portsea, Hants, Grocer. Apr 18 at 3 at 145, Cheapside. Walker and Wainscot, Landport

Bamberger, Julius Walton, Middlesborough, Spirit Merchant. Apr 18 at 3 at office of Bainbridge and Barnley, Albert rd, Middlesborough

Barber, Samuel, Gorleston, Suffolk, Tinplate Worker. Apr 16 at 3 at office of Diver, King st, Gt Yarmouth

Barnes, John, Northfield, Worcester, Grocer. Apr 13 at 3 at office of Neville, Union passage, Birmingham. Owen

Beak, Isaac, Hullavington, Wilts, Farmer. Apr 14 at 11 at King's Arms Hotel, Malmesbury. Jones and Forrester, Malmesbury

Beaumont, George, Langley, Norfolk, Farmer. Apr 20 at 2.30 at office of Culley and Gould, Queen st, Norwich. Birkett and Bantoft, Ipswich

Benson, Walter, Swansea, Wine Merchant. Apr 13 at 2 at Cameron Arms Hotel, Swansea. Thomas, Swansea

Berry, Samuel Abell, Sibson, Leicester, Farmer. Apr 17 at 12 at George Hotel, Market pl, Hinckley. Fowler and Co, Leicester

Blenkinsop, William Henry, Bournemouth, M.D. Apr 12 at 12 at office of Wade, Old Christchurch rd, Bournemouth

Bolton, Henry, Berkswell, Warwick, out of business. Apr 12 at 11 at office of Hughes and Masser, Little Park st, Coventry

...dley, James Moorhouse, Burnley, Grocer. Apr 13 at 3 at office of Nowell, Hargreaves st, Burnley
...well, Joseph, Chinner, Oxford, Grocer. Apr 19 at 12.30 at Railway Hotel, Princes Risborough. Fell, Aylesbury
...cklesby, George, Kingston upon Hull, Builder. Apr 13 at 3 at office of Laverack, Land of Green Ginger, Kingston upon Hull
...rown, Robert, Wallsend, Builder. Apr 13 at 2 at office of Joel and Co, Newgate st, Newcastle on Tyne
...rnaden, George William, Westow Hill, Upper Norwood, Auctioneer. Apr 16 at 3 at 111, Cheapside. Clift
...rkett, Thomas, High st, Kensington, Butcher. Apr 23 at 3 at office of Andrews and Mason, Ironmonger lane. Clark, Walbrook
...rns, Christopher, Gt Grimsby, Fishing Vessel Owner. Apr 16 at 3.30 at office of Stephenson and Mountain, Bethlehem st, Gt Grimsby
...sterall, Thomas Franklin, Folkestone, Confectioner. Apr 20 at 2 at Rose Hotel, Folkestone. Minter, Folkestone
...rles, James, Morton, nr Gainsborough, Lincoln, Bricklayer. Apr 12 at 11 at office of Bladon, Market pl, Gainsborough
...ffins, Charles Thomas Hill, Pratt st, Camden Town, Builder. Apr 16 at 2 at Masons' Hall Tavern, Masons' avenue, Basinghall st. Digby and Co, Gresham st
...ver, Joe, Failsworth, Lancaster, Hotel Keeper. Apr 17 at 3 at office of Simondson, John Dalton st, Manchester
...croft, James, and John Clay, Hebden Bridge, York, Cotton Manufacturers. Apr 16 at 11 at White Horse Hotel, Hebden Bridge. Longbottom, Halifax
...ldridge, William Henry, jun, Crediton, Devon, Draper. Apr 17 at 3 at office of Fewings, Queen st, Exeter. Searle, Crediton
...tchley, Thomas, Catterall, Salford, Lancaster, Wood Turner. Apr 18 at 3 at office of Stelfox, Hilton st, Oldham st, Manchester
...lis, Thomas William, Broseley, Salop, Baker. Apr 14 at 11 at office of Leake, High st, Shifnal
...llis, Fred, Bristol, Plumber. Apr 16 at 2 at office of Hobbs, Clare st, Bristol
...yson, Joseph, West Vale, nr Halifax, York, Grocer. Apr 13 at 11 at Griffin Hotel, George st, Halifax. Garsed, Halifax
...st, Frederick William, Bermondsey st, Tanner. Apr 14 at 3 at Guildhall Tavern, Gresham st. Montagu, Bucklersbury
...ton, Thomas Tonbridge, Wellington st, Strand, Licensed Victualler. Apr 18 at 3 at office of Nash and Field, Queen st, Cheapside
...wards, Thomas, and Alfred Blake, Trafalgar rd, Old Kent rd, Builders. Apr 14 at 2 at office of Grayston, Chancery lane
...lis, Annie Watson, Scarborough, Hotel Keeper. Apr 13 at 3 at Pavilion Hotel, Scarborough. Watts and Kitching, Scarborough
...lis, John William, Hemel Hempstead, Mercer. Apr 13 at 2 at 136, High Holborn. Annesley, St Albans
...rns, Mary, Manchester, Lodging house keeper. Apr 19 at 3 at office of Law and Ward, Mitre bldgs, Cathedral gates, Manchester
...rsberg, Jacob, Cheetham, Cap Maker. Apr 16 at 3 at office of Gardner, Cooper st, Manchester
...ir, Septimus, Warwick, Brewery Manager. Apr 18 at 1 at Woolpack Hotel, Warwick. Sanderson, Warwick
...tes, Edwin Alexander, Brighton, Builder. Apr 12 at 12 at 152, North st, Brighton. Maynard
...tty, Frederick Albert, Accrington, Dyer. Apr 19 at 3 at office of Addleshaw and Warburton, Norfolk st, Manchester
...ison, William Evans, Epworth, Lincoln, Draper. Apr 10 at 2 at office of Weston and Postlethwaite, Park row, Leeds, in lieu of place originally named
...ld, Benjamin, New Windsor, Coachbuilder. Apr 16 at 3 at office of Eyre and Co, John st, Bedford row. Long and Co, New Windsor
...ugh, Robert, York, Butcher. Apr 13 at 11 at office of Crumbie, Stonegate, York
...ffiths, Thomas James, Trefriw, Carnarvon, Grocer. Apr 16 at 2 at Albion Hotel, Chester. Ellis, Llanrwst
...mmer, William Jacob, Greenwich, Builder. Apr 18 at 3 at Maitland House, Greenwich. Howard and Shelton, Greenwich
...ey, Robert, Red Lion st, Clerkenwell, Silversmith. Apr 16 at 3 at office of Read, Chancery lane
...rris, Jonah, Birmingham, Fruiterer. Apr 14 at 10.30 at office of Fallows, Cherry st, Birmingham
...dwick, John, Brindle, Lancaster, Farmer. Apr 18 at 11 at office of Clarke, Lune st, Preston
...kman, John, Welchpool, Montgomery, Ironmonger. Apr 18 at 1 at office of Jones, Severn st, Welchpool
...nton, Annie Maria, Northwich, Chester, Baker. Apr 19 at 11 at office of Fletcher, Northwich
...ward, William, Chase Side, Southgate, Nurseryman. Apr 17 at 3 at Jamaica Coffee house, St Michael's alley. Warburton and De Paula, West st, Finsbury circus
...rst, Jonah, Kingham, Oxford, Butcher. Apr 14 at 11 at Crown Hotel, Chipping Norton. Wilkins, Chipping Norton
...herwood, Robert Thomas, and John Forrest Isherwood, New Brighton, Chester, Wine Merchants. Apr 25 at 3 at office of Nelson, Lord st, Liverpool. Collins and Co, Liverpool
...kson, Charles Walter, Nottingham, Lacemaker. Apr 14 at 12 at office of Stevenson, Weekday cross, Nottingham
...kson, Joseph, South Shields, General Dealer. Apr 11 at 3 at office of Scott, King st, South Shields
...rman, John Abbot, Redhill, Surrey, Military Tutor. Apr 23 at 11 at office of Edmonds, St James' st, Portsea. Mills, Serjeants' inn, Chancery lane
...kins, Mary, Llanelly, Carmarthen, Publican. Apr 12 at 12 at office of Snead, Llanelly
...hnson, Joseph, Liverpool, Florist. Apr 16 at 3 at office of Harper, Cable st, Liverpool. Cole, Liverpool
...nes, Robert, Graham rd, Dalston, Commercial Traveller. Apr 18 at 2 at office of Kilsby, College hill, Cannon st
...tley, James, Gt Coggeshall, Essex, Farmer. Apr 18 at 3 at office of Jones, Townhall chbrs, Colchester
...wton, George, Salford, Lancaster, Licensed Victualler. Apr 16 at 3.30 at office of Whitworth, Manchester
...ather, John Kettlewell, Leeds, Boot Upper Manufacturer. Apr 13 at 2 at office of Pullan, Albion st, Leeds
...vers, George, Nottingham, Butcher. Apr 11 at 12 at office of Fraser, Wheeler gate, Nottingham
...kin, John, Nottingham, Aerated Water Manufacturer. Apr 18 at 3 at office of Cockayne, Fletcher gate, Nottingham
...raden, George William, Stockport, nr Manchester, Coal Merchant. Apr 12 at 1.30 at office of Sutton and Elliott, Fountain st, Manchester
...ather, George, Staveley, Derby, Sexton. Apr 14 at 3 at office of Jones and Middleton, Gluman gate, Chesterfield
...cEvoy, Thomas Alexander, Preston, Druggist. Apr 13 at 11 at 16, Winckley st, Preston. Jukes, Preston
...cLean, Betty, Lee, Dealer in Fancy Goods. Apr 11 at 1 at Trafalgar Hotel, Greenwich. Ogle, Finsbury sq bldgs, Chiswell st
...ller, Robert, Bolton, Clog Iron Maker. Apr 13 at 11.30 at office of Cooper, Mawdsley st, Bolton
...len, Charles Robert, Chirk, Denbigh, Colliery Proprietor. Apr 17 at 2 at office of Foss and Ledsam, Abchurch lane
...nton, Samuel, Manchester, Baker. Apr 18 at 3 at office of Crofton, Brazennose st, Manchester
...ttle, Thomas Edward, Liverpool, Joiner. Apr 17 at 3 at office of Horner, Stafford st, Liverpool
Palmer, Amos, King's Cliffe, Northampton, Publican. Apr 17 at 10 at office of Law, St Mary's pl, Stamford
Pangborn, George, Tring, Joiner. Apr 14 at 3.30 at Bell Inn, Tring. Reader, Ely pl, Holborn
Paparritor, Demetrius Michael, and Alcibiades Demetrius Margaritis, Mark lane, Merchants. Apr 19 at 3 at Cooper and Co, George st, Mansion House. Hollams and Co, Mincing lane
Parker, Thomas, Melton Mowbray, Shoemaker. Apr 19 at 3 at offices of Gee and Parr, Gallowtree gate, Leicester
Parsons, James, Salisbury, Tinman. Apr 18 at 11 at office of Hodding, Market House chambers, Salisbury
Pennington, William, Darley, nr Ripley, nr York, Farmer. Apr 14 at 11 office of Barber, Harrogate
Pentelow, William, Colmworth, Bedford, Farmer. Apr 17 at 3 at office of Wilkinson and Co, St Neots
Phillips, Frederick William, Fenchurch st, Ship's Store Dealer. Apr 14 at 11 at 2, St Mary Axe. Cray, Leadenhall st
Pope, William Henry, Dudley, Worcester, Brass Founder. Apr 13 at 11.30 at office of Homfray and Holberton, High st, Brierley hill
Price, Lewis, Sutton, Surrey. Apr 14 at 11 at office of Damant, Theobald's rd, Bedford row
Rammell, Richard, Macclesfield, Baker. Apr 16 at 3 at office of Barclay and Henstock, Exchange st, Macclesfield
Ray, Enoch, Madeley Wood, nr Ironbridge, Salop, Miner. Apr 14 at 11 at office of Phillips and Co, Madeley
Rea, Edward, Deal, Licensed Victualler. Apr 23 at 11 at 5, Park st, Deal. Hall
Reed, Percival, Hyde Park, Club Proprietor. Apr 18 at 3 at office of Davidson and Morriss, Queen Victoria st
Reynolds, Joshua, Shottesham St Mary, Norfolk, Farmer. Apr 12 at 11 at office of Miller and Co, Bank chbrs, Norwich
Ridley, William, Market Harborough, Leicester, Gas Fitter. Apr 16 at 3 at Angel Hotel, Market Harborough. Owston and Co, Leicester
Robbins, Joseph, Devizes, Wilts, Draper. Apr 20 at 12 at 145, Cheapside. Brittan and Co, Bristol
Rose, William, Walton, nr Liverpool, Fishmonger. Apr 16 at 3 at office of Horner, Stafford st, Liverpool
Rutherford, John, Spennymoor House, Durham, Farmer. Apr 16 at 11.30 at office of Edgar, Silver st, Bishop Auckland
Sagar, Thomas, Burnley, Lancaster, Machinist. Apr 16 at 3 at office of Nowell, Hargreaves st, Burnley
Sheard, Thomas, West Ardley, York, out of business. Apr 16 at 3 at office of Burton, Wood st, Wakefield
Shepherd, Frederick, Newark-upon-Trent, Saddler. Apr 12 at 3 at office of Stevenson, Bridlesmith gate, Nottingham
Sleet, George Alfred, Bradford, Umbrella Maker. Apr 14 at 10.30 at office of Cross, Parkinson's chbrs, Bradford
Smith, Frank, Dewsbury, Yarn Spinner. Apr 16 at 10.30 at office of Ridgway, Union st, Dewsbury
Tumilty, John Spencer, Liverpool, Colliery Proprietor. Apr 18 at 3 at 14, Cook st, Liverpool. Quinn and Sons, Liverpool
Tyler, Henry, Bridgnorth, Salop, Grocer. Apr 13 at 2.30 at office of Haslewood, Bank st, Bridgnorth
Urry, William Phillips, Gosport, Bootmaker. Apr 17 at 3 at office of Edmonds and Co, Cheapside. Blake and Reed, Portsea
Wheal, Emma, Leamington Priors, Warwick, Cook. Apr 24 at 2 at Bath Hotel, Bath st, Leamington Priors. Abbott, Leamington
Whitaker, Thomas, Leeds, Cloth Manufacturer. Apr 16 at 2 at office of Pickering, Oriental chbrs, Cookridge st, Leeds
Whitmore, John, Leamington Priors, Warwick, Stonemason. Apr 16 at 11 at office of Boddington, High st, Warwick
Willcox, Edmund, Weston super Mare, Somerset, Boot Dealer. Apr 13 at 2 at office of Clifton and Carter, Broad st, Bristol
Williams, Edmund, Cardiff, out of business. Apr 12 at 3 at office of Evans, Church st, Cardiff
Williams, John, Newport (I.W.), Butcher. Apr 16 at 11 at 64, Lugley st, Newport. Beckingsale, Newport
Willis, George, Bell, Middlesboro, York, Iron Manufacturer. Apr 14 at 11 at office of Jackson and Jackson, Albert rd, Middlesboro
Wookey, James, Ventnor (I.W.), Surgeon. Apr 13 at 11 at Crab and Lobster Hotel, Ventnor. Boyes, Barnet
Woolnough, William, Beccles, Suffolk, Fish Merchant. Apr 19 at 12 at office of Blake, Hall Quay chbrs, Gt Yarmouth. Palmer, Gt Yarmouth
Wright, John, Ware Side, Hertford, out of business. Apr 19 at 2.30 at Bull Hotel, Gt Hadham. Armstrong, Hertford

The Subscription to the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL *is—Town, 26s.; Country, 28s.; with the* WEEKLY REPORTER, *52s. Payment in advance includes Double Numbers and Postage. Subscribers can have their Volumes bound at the office—cloth, 2s. 6d., half law calf, 5s. 6d.*

All letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors' Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the writer.

Where difficulty is experienced in procuring the Journal with regularity in the Country, it is requested that application be made direct to the Publisher.

CONTENTS.

CURRENT TOPICS 373
THE NEW PATENTS, DESIGNS, AND TRADE-MARKS BILLS 375
SOME MISCELLANEOUS POINTS IN THE GOVERNMENT BANKRUPTCY BILL .. 377
CORRESPONDENCE 379
CASES OF THE WEEK—
The Photographic Artists' Supply Association 379
Danvillier v. Myers 379
In re Tootal's Trusts 380
SOCIETIES 380
LAW STUDENTS' JOURNAL 382
LEGAL APPOINTMENTS 383
LEGISLATION OF THE WEEK 383
COURT PAPERS 383
COMPANIES 389
LONDON GAZETTES, &c., &c. 390

NOTICES TO CORRESPONDENTS.—*All communications intended for publication in the* SOLICITORS' JOURNAL *must be authenticated by the name and address of the writer.*

The Editor does not hold himself responsible for the return of rejected communications.

*** *The Publisher requests that early application should be made by persons desirous of obtaining back numbers of the* SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, *as only a small number of copies remain on hand.*

SCHWEITZER'S COCOATINA,

ANTI-Dyspeptic Cocoa or Chocolate Powder.

Guaranteed Pure Soluble Cocoa of the Finest Quality, with the excess of fat extracted.

The Faculty pronounce it "the most nutritious, perfectly digestible beverage for Breakfast, Luncheon, or Supper, and invaluable for Invalids and Children."

Highly commended by the entire Medical Press.

Being without sugar, spice, or other admixture, it suits all palates, keeps better in all climates, and is four times the strength of cocoas THICKENED yet WEAKENED with starch, &c., and IN REALITY CHEAPER than such Mixtures.

Made instantaneously with boiling water, a teaspoonful to a Breakfast Cup, costing less than a halfpenny.

COCOATINA A LA VANILLE is the most delicate, digestible, cheapest Manilla Chocolate, and may be taken when richer chocolate is prohibited.

In tin packets at 1s. 6d., 3s., 5s. 6d., &c., by Chemists and Grocers.

Charities on Special Terms by the Sole Proprietors, H. SCHWEITZER & CO 10, Adam-street, London, W.C.

TO SOLICITORS and Others.—Lofty and well-lighted Offices and Chambers, at Lonsdale-chambers, No. 27, Chancery-lane (opposite the New Law Courts), from £15 per annum per room.—Apply to Messrs. LAUNDY & Co., Chartered Accountants, on the Premises.

CORNHILL.—To be Let, a compact Suite of Offices, comprising four floors and cellars in basement. Suitable for a firm of Solicitors or Financial Agents.—Apply to Messrs. S. WALKER & RUNTZ, 22, Moorgate-street, E.C.

TO SOLICITORS.—Commodious and well-furnished Office, central position, rent £25 per annum inclusive.—HOWARD & PIGGOTT, Accountants, 227, Coldharbour-lane, Loughborough Junction, S.W.

HAMPTON & SONS make NO CHARGE for inserting particulars in their FREE MONTHLY REGISTER of ESTATES, TOWN and COUNTRY HOUSES, Furnished or Unfurnished, or for Sale, to be had GRATIS at their Offices, or post-free for two stamps. Published on the 1st of the month, and particulars for insertion should be sent not later than five days previous to end of preceding month.

Valuations for Probate and Transfer. Surveys.

Estate and Auction Offices, 6, Pall Mall East, S.W.

MESSRS. DEBENHAM, TEWSON, FARMER, & BRIDGEWATER'S LIST of ESTATES and HOUSES to be SOLD or LET, including Landed Estates, Town and Country Residences, Hunting and Shooting Quarters, Farms, Ground Rents, Rent Charges, House Property and Investments generally, is published on the first day of each month, and may be obtained, free of charge, at their offices, 80, Cheapside, E.C., or will be sent by post in return for two stamps.—Particulars for insertion should be received not later than four days previous to the end of the preceding month.

FIVE PER CENT. DEBENTURES.

R. GOLDSBROUGH & CO., Limited (late Australasian Agency and Banking Corporation, Limited), are now prepared to ISSUE DEBENTURES, bearing interest 5 per cent per annum, payable half-yearly for five or seven years.

The Company is also prepared to receive money on deposit on terms of interest to be arranged.

The capital of the Company is £3,000,000, in 300,000 shares of £10 each.

Capital paid up, £200,000. Reserve, £75,000.

LONDON DIRECTORS.

Abraham Scott, Esq., Director of the National Bank of Australasia.

Harry Hankey Dobree, Esq., of Messrs. Samuel Dobree & Sons.

Joseph Cockfield Dimsdale, of Messrs. Dimsdale, Fowler, & Co.

Frank C. Capel, Esq., of Messrs. James Capel & Co.

London Secretary—William Frederick Moore, Esq.

Solicitors—Messrs. Freshfields & Williams.

Forms of application can be obtained at the offices of the Company, 156 and 157, Leadenhall-street, E.C.

NORTHERN ASSURANCE COMPANY

Established 1836.

FIRE AND LIFE. AT HOME AND ABROAD.

HEAD OFFICES:—LONDON AND ABERDEEN.

Fire Premiums	£451,000
Life Premiums	181,000
Interest...	120,000
Accumulated Funds	£2,708,000

COMMERCIAL UNION ASSURANCE COMPANY.—FIRE, LIFE, MARINE.

Capital fully subscribed	£2,500,000
Capital paid-up	250,000
Life Funds in Special Trust for Life Policy-holders exceed	809,000
Total Annual Premium Income exceeds ..	1,077,000

CHIEF OFFICES: 19 AND 20, CORNHILL, LONDON, E.C.
WEST END OFFICE: 8, PALL MALL, LONDON, S.W.

SUN FIRE AND LIFE OFFICES, Threadneedle-street, E.C.; Charing Cross, S.W.; Oxford-street (corner of Vere-street), W.

FIRE. Established 1710. Home and Foreign Insurances at moderate rates.

LIFE. Established 1810 Specially low rates for young lives. Large bonuses. Immediate settlement of claims.

ESTABLISHED 1825.

HEWETSON, THEXTON, & PEART,

MANUFACTURERS AND HOUSE FURNISHERS,

200, 203, and 204, TOTTENHAM COURT ROAD, W.

Estimates and Designs submitted free for entirely Furnishing Residences, Chambers, Offices, &c.

—PAINTING, DECORATING, & HOUSE REPAIRS.—

Carved Oak Furniture, Reproductions from Ancient Designs, &c. Bedroom Furniture, including Bedstead and Bedding, from £7 10s. per set.

THIRTY LARGE SHOW ROOMS.

HEWETSON, THEXTON, & PEART,

200, 203, and 204, Tottenham Court-road, London, W.

N.B.—Household Furniture Warehoused or Removed on reasonable terms

ACCIDENTS!—64, CORNHILL.

NO MAN IS SAFE FROM ACCIDENTS.

WISE MEN INSURE AGAINST THEIR COST!

ACCIDENTS BY LAND OR WATER

INSURED AGAINST BY THE

RAILWAY PASSENGERS' ASSURANCE COMPANY,

The Oldest and Largest Company, insuring against Accidents of all kinds.

SUBSCRIBED CAPITAL, £1,000,000.

PAID-UP CAPITAL AND RESERVE, £250,000.

MODERATE PREMIUMS.

Bonus allowed to Insurers after Five Years.

£1,840,000

HAS BEEN PAID AS COMPENSATION.

Apply to the Clerks at the Railway Stations, the Local Agents,

Or 8, GRAND HOTEL BUILDINGS, CHARING CROSS, or at the HEAD OFFICE—64, CORNHILL, LONDON.

WILLIAM J. VIAN, Secretary.

ESTABLISHED 1851.

BIRKBECK BANK.—Southampton-buildings, Chancery-lane.

Current Accounts opened according to the usual practice of other Bankers, and Interest allowed on the minimum monthly balances when not drawn below £25. No commission charged for keeping Accounts. The Bank also receives money on Deposit at Three per Cent. Interest, repayable on demand. The Bank undertakes for its Customers, free of charge, the custody of Deeds, Writings, and other Securities and Valuables; the collection of Bills of Exchange, Dividends, and Coupons; and the purchase and sale of Stocks and Shares. Letters of Credit and Circular Notes issued.

A Pamphlet, with full particulars, on application.

FRANCIS RAVENSCROFT, Manager

31st March, 1880.

BY AUTHORITY.

The Companies Acts, 1862 to 1880.

Every requisite under the above Acts supplied on the shortest notice.

The BOOKS and FORMS kept in stock for immediate use.

MEMORANDA and ARTICLES OF ASSOCIATION speedily printed in the proper form for registration and distribution. SHARE CERTIFICATES, DEBENTURES, &c., engraved and printed. OFFICIAL SEALS designed and executed. No Charge for Sketches.

Solicitors' Account Books.

RICHARD FLINT & CO

(Late ASH & FLINT),

Stationers, Printers, Engravers, Registration Agents, 49, FLEET-STREET, LONDON, E.C. (corner of Serjeants'-inn).

Annual and other Returns Stamped and Filed

GOLD PEN,

WITH DIAMOND POINT,

Anti-corrosive—Flexible—Durable—Adapting itself to any Handwriting.

Price 6d. each; post-free, 7d.

With White Metal Pocket Holder, complete	1s.
Or, with Mordan's Best Silver Pocket Holders—	
Fluted Pattern, complete	5s. 6d.
Engine-turned Pattern, complete	6s. 6d.
Fluted Pattern, Telescopic	10s. 6d.

Other patterns in great variety.

ALEXANDER & SHEPHEARD,

27 CHANCERY LANE, LONDON.

EDE AND SON,

ROBE MAKERS

BY SPECIAL APPOINTMENT,

To Her Majesty, the Lord Chancellor, the Whole of the Judicial Bench, Corporation of London &c.

SOLICITORS' AND REGISTRARS' GOWNS

BARRISTERS' AND QUEEN'S COUNSEL'S DITTO.

CORPORATION ROBES, UNIVERSITY & CLERGY GOWNS.

ESTABLISHED 1689.

94, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON.

OXON and BERKS BANK, OXFORD.

ESTABLISHED 1854,

Makes CASH ADVANCES to Barristers, Solicitors, Clergymen, Medical Men, residing in any part of England and Wales. No banking account need be opened

PARTRIDGE & COOPER

LAW AND GENERAL STATIONERS,

1 & 2, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON, E.C.

Law Copying and Engrossing.

Deeds and Writings engrossed and copied on the Premises with punctuality and dispatch, at the lowest scale charges. A good Discount allowed on agreed accounts.

LAW PRINTING.

STATEMENTS OF CLAIM AND DEFENCE, AFFIDAVITS, and other PLEADING, Printed at 1s. per folio.

DEEDS, CONVEYANCES, MORTGAGES, &c., Printed in form for Registration.

Discount allowed for cash on agreed accounts.

LITHOGRAPHY.

ABSTRACTS, BRIEFS, PETITIONS, DRAFTS, MINUTES OF EVIDENCE, Lithographed at reduced prices.

PLANS OF ESTATES, SPECIFICATIONS, BUILDING SOCIETIES' DEEDS, LEASES, &c., Lithographed with accuracy and dispatch.

PARCHMENT AND LEGAL PAPERS

Samples and Catalogues sent post-free.

AN IMPORTANT CONVENIENCE TO LAW WRITERS AND SOLICITORS.

STEPHENS' SCARLET INK FOR STEEL PENS.

This new Ink supplies the demand continually made but never before met, for a Red Ink which is unimpaired by Steel or other Metallic Pens. Steel Pens left in this Ink for months do not impair the beauty of its colour, nor are the Pens in the least corroded by it. The acids in Inks rapidly destroy Steel Pens, and lose their red colour if used with other than Gold or Quill Pens. This new colour is a very rich scarlet red of great beauty. The colour of this ink is not affected by use upon parchment and is consequently of great value to Solicitors and Draughtsmen.

Sold in stone bottles, retail at 1s., 2s., 3s.; and imperial quarts of 40 ounces at 6s. each. Also in glass bottles at 6d. and 1s. each.

SOLD BY ALL STATIONERS.

THE CHURCH PREFERMENT GAZETTE for April, containing full particulars of Advowsons, Presentations, &c., for Sale, together with useful advice to purchasers, should be referred to by every purchaser. Edited by Mr. W. EMERY STARK (Associate Institute of Actuaries, F.R.G.S., &c.).—Address (enclosing six stamps), Messrs. W. EMERY STARK & Co., 3, Bedford-street, Strand.

Price 10s. 6d.

THE YEAR'S DECISIONS:

A DIGEST

OF ALL THE

CASES DECIDED IN THE SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE,

AND ALSO IN THE

BANKRUPTCY AND ECCLESIASTICAL COURTS,

WITH

APPEALS TO THE HOUSE OF LORDS AND PRIVY COUNCIL;

ALSO OF

CASES DECIDED IN THE SUPERIO COURTS IN IRELAND;

FROM 3RD OF NOVEMBER, 1881, TO 2ND OF SEPTEMBER, 1882

By EDMUND FULLER GRIFF Esq., B.A.

Barrister-at-Law

LONDON: 27, CHANCERY